

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY, 1916.

## AMYNTOR IN THE *DOLONEIA*.

WHEN Odysseus and Diomede are about to set out on their adventure in the tenth *Iliad*, Meriones lends the former a noble κυνέη, the workmanship of which is carefully described. Then comes its history, which opens with the lines (K 266 sq.) :

τὴν ρά ποτ' ἐξ Ἐλεῶνος Ἀμύντορος Ὄρμενίδαο  
ἐξέλετ' Αὐτόλυκος<sup>1</sup> πυκινὸν δόμον ἀντιτορήσας.

That, as has often been observed, is in apparent conflict with I. 447 sqq., where Amyntor, son of Ormenos (and father of Phoenix), is settled in Hellas. The *Doloneia*, on the other hand, represents him as inhabiting Eleon, which is in Boeotia (B 500). Some have solved the difficulty by the not very violent supposition that there was an Eleon in Hellas, and others with the remark that Amyntor may not have always lived so far north.

These are critics who can consider the contents of the *Doloneia* without impatience, but theirs is not the general attitude. Dr. Leaf, in his edition of the *Iliad*, considers the lay to be the production of a late bard, whom he does not suffer gladly, and in his recent work (*Homer and History*, 116 sq.) deals the unfortunate one more rebuke, this time for reprehensible levity in his treatment of a heroic personage. ‘There is nothing to show that the author of the *Doloneia* did more than take the first name that came to hand for a piquant anecdote; if he thought of Amyntor as a Hellene at all, he conceals the fact.’

The couplet in K is really worth more consideration than it has yet received. In the first place, it is difficult, if not impossible, to construe it satisfactorily. How is the genitive Ἀμύντορος to be accounted for? The commentators generally note that it depends on δόμον, and this view has the very high support of Dr. Leaf and Dr. Monro. But it is the fact that such a disjunction as this involves is unparalleled in Homer. There appears to be no collection in the books of instances of dislocation of sentences, and it is perhaps not generally known how extraordinarily few such departures from the Homeric

<sup>1</sup> A few editors put a comma here.

clearness and directness are. Editors comment on M 177 sq., Μ 153 sq., Ο 14, Φ 504, and Ψ 339 sq. In the *Odyssey* there seems to be nothing worth mentioning, except perhaps ζ 53 sq. There are a number of other passages in which, as in the case under consideration, the genitive is separated from the noun governing it, as *κρατερόν ρά ἐ πένθος | ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκάλυψε κασιγνήτου*, or *Πανθοῖδαο | χειρὸς ἀπὸ στιβαρῆς ἄλιον πηδῆσαι ἄκοντα*, but in these there is no violence to the structure of the sentence. In our couplet the genitive comes first, and is left *pendens*, without government, while the main course of the sentence, which this genitive interrupts, is completed, when a subsidiary clause is added providing a noun to rescue the stranded genitive. If we are bound to this interpretation, the disorder of the sentence is unique.

The alternative construction would be to read 'Ελεῶνος 'Αμύντορος together, and to translate 'the Eleon of Amyntor' or 'Amyntor's (city) Eleon'; but to such a combination an exact parallel cannot be found. The genitive would be like that in 'Οἰλῆος Αἴας, but there seems to be no case in which the name of a place is so used, though instances like δῆμος 'Ερεχθῖος and ἄστυ Πριάμου are common enough. The nearest perhaps is Πύλος Νηλήιος, where the adjective is equivalent to Νηλῆος, as in 'Οδυσσῆος δόμος, Αἰπύτιος τύμβος, etc. This alternative construction of 'Αμύντορος is in fact as unique as the other.

So the possibility of corruption may be considered. A conjectural restoration must be 'intrinsically suitable,' and 'such as to account for the corrupt reading in the transmitted text' (Jebb in the *Companion to Greek Studies*, 621). I suggest *εἰσελθὼν ἐσ* for ἐξ 'Ελεῶνος as fulfilling these conditions.

The words are very similar in sound to ἐξ 'Ελεῶνος, they give excellent sense, and the construction is rendered clear. And the language is thoroughly Homeric. The preposition is not infrequently used redundantly. For an occurrence of *ἐσ* with ἐσέρχομαι see δ 802. For *ἐσ* with δόμον or the like understood, we have *ἐσ* 'Αλκινόοι, *ἐσ* 'Αθηναίης, etc.

Next, the corruption has to be accounted for—*ἐξ* 'Ελεῶνος from an original *εἰσελθὼν ἐσ*. The confusion of -ος and -εσ need not detain us. It has occurred elsewhere, as in Eurip. *Alc.* 31, μηὸς ἔρχεται and μὴν ἐσέρχεται. There remains *ἐξ* 'Ελε-, which a scribe—*uicina uicinis accommodans*, as Cobet phrases it—may have introduced from the opening of the line below, *ἐξέλε(τ')*. This is an *allbekannte* source of error (Blass in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch, Einleitende*, 253). 'A scribe often substituted for the true word a word from the immediate context in a temporary aberration of mind,' Professor Lindsay says in his *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, 66. He has kindly referred me to an exactly similar case to the present one in Plautus, *Mostellaria*, 73 sq.,

*uenire quod moleste quam illuc quod cupide petas.  
molestus ne sis,*

where *moleste* is held to be wrong, and to have crept into the text from the *molestus* of the second line.<sup>1</sup> In the *Doloneia* the *ἐξέλε-* may well have had the

<sup>1</sup> See *C.R.*, xix. 110.

same effect, but it is also to be noticed that the syllables introduced, ἔξ Ἐλε-, are, from a palaeographical point of view, very similar to those displaced, εἰσελθό-. ξ has taken the place of ισ and ε that of θ. Now both these changes are familiar. See Jebb, *l.c.*, 611, Blass, *l.c.*, 264, and Cobet, *Variae Lectiones*, 6, 279 sq. and 370. All three authorities mention the frequent confusion of ἐκ or ἔξ with ἐς or εἰς. For two instances in the *Iliad* see N 214 and Σ 492.

And, finally, it is very noteworthy that the participle εἰσελθών(-οῦσα) occurs seven times in the *Iliad* (there happens to be no occurrence in the *Odyssey*), and that in no fewer than five of these it occupies the exact position, after the first foot, to which it is now proposed to restore it. The other two occurrences are of a repeated line, in which the participle occupies the first place.

It seems hard to resist the conclusion that the translation of Amyntor to Eleon was the work of a scribe, and that one more blot may be removed from the surface of ἡ ταλαιπωρος Δολώνεια.

A. SHEWAN.

ST. ANDREWS.

### EURIPIDES, *SYPPLICES*, 1114 SQ.

τάδε δὴ παιδῶν καὶ δὴ φθιμένων  
δστᾶ φέρετε. λάβετ', ἀμφίπολοι, κ.τ.λ.

So MSS. For φέρετε metri causa Scaliger proposed φέρεται, an emendation rightly accepted by editors. In the preceding line καὶ δὴ conceals a corruption.

Wilamowitz reads :

καὶ μὴν παιδῶν τάδε δὴ.

The change, however, is too violent to recommend itself on palaeographic grounds. In his *notatio critica* Murray says : Fortasse παισὶ.

Following παιδῶν, παισὶ seems somewhat weak.

For καὶ δὴ I would suggest the neuter plural of κῆδος, κῆδη and punctuate after φθιμένων :

τάδε δὴ παιδῶν κῆδη φθιμένων.  
δστᾶ φέρεται. λάβετ', ἀμφίπολοι, κ.τ.λ.

We may compare Pind. *P.* IV. 200 :

κῆδος φθιμένου θήκασθαι.

H. G. VILJOEN.

MIDDELBURG (CAPE).

## EMENDATIONS IN EURIPIDES' *MEDEA*.

*Medea* v. 856 sqq.

*πόθεν θράσος ἢ φρενὸς ἢ  
χειρὶ τέκνων σέθεν  
καρδίᾳ τε λήψῃ  
δεινὰν προσάγουσα τόλμαν;*

So the MSS. The only emendation worth mentioning is that of Porson's censor *Class. Journ.* I. 565: *ἄφρονισῆ* for *ἢ φρενὸς ἢ*. The error appears to me to be even simpler. We need not make any violent change. It is a case of accents and punctuation. The reading and punctuation I would suggest are:

*πόθεν θράσος ὢ φρενός; ὢ  
χειρὶ τέκνων σέθεν  
καρδίᾳ τε λήψῃ  
δεινὰν προσάγουσα τόλμαν;*

For *θράσος φρενός* we may compare Soph. *Aias* 46:

*πόσαισι τόλμαις ταῖσδε καὶ φρενῶν θράσει;*

*Ibid.* 909 sq. Perhaps we should read:

*εἰκὸς γὰρ ὄργας θῆλυ πουεῖσθαι γένος  
γάμου παρεμπολῶντος ἀλλ' οὐ πόσει.*

*ἀλλοίον* of the MSS. cannot be right.

*Ibid.* 1087 sqq.

*πάσαισι μὲν οὖ· παῦρον δὲ δὴ  
γένος ἐν πολλαῖς εὑροις ἀν ἵσως  
κούκ ἀπόμουσον τὸ γυναικῶν.*

No satisfactory emendation of this passage has yet been offered. Transposition of vv. 1088 and 1089 seems to be the least violent change:

<i>πάσαισι μὲν οὖ· παῦρον δὲ δὴ</i>	<i>1089</i>
<i>κούκ ἀπόμουσον τὸ γυναικῶν</i>	<i>1088</i>
<i>γένος ἐν πολλαῖς εὑροις ἀν ἵσως.</i>	

*Ibid.* 1267 sqq. Perhaps we should read:

*ἀμείβεται  
χαλεπὰ γὰρ βροτοῖς ὁμογενῆ μιά-  
σματ' ἔτι τ' αἰών' αἰτοφόνταις ξύνω-  
δά θεόθεν πίτνοντ' ἐπὶ δόμοις ἄχη.*

In uncials *ΕΤΙΤΑΙΑΝ* could easily be corrupted into *ΕΠΙΓΑΙΑΝ*. Hesychius has the gloss:

*αἰανόν· χαλεπόν, κακόν.*

As a rule critics believe in the form *αἰανῆς*. But apart from Hesychius' testimony MS. evidence supports the form *αἰανός* which I think could be read is Aeschylus' *Septem contra Thebas* 848:

*διπλαῖν μερίμναιν δίδυμ' αἰών' ὥρα κακά, κτλ.*

H. G. VILJOEN.

MIDDELBURG (CAPE).

rson's  
to me  
ase of  
are :

ans-

nus

ius'  
ead

.

## NOTES ON CATULLVS.

THE completion of a critical text of Catullus, which Teubner expects soon to publish, furnishes a plausible excuse for offering a few observations on readings:

29. 20 Hunc gallie timet et britannie (brittanie O) **GORM** (*spatium solito maius post timet reliquit R*).

Catullus certainly wrote one poem (c. 4) in pure iambic trimeters. If this were not certain, there would not be so strong a reason to believe that c. 29 is in the same metre. But a mere quatrain (c. 52) alone represents the common, Archilochian, trimeters; and even if c. 4 were missing, the overwhelming number of pure iambics in c. 29 might compel the critic to the belief that vv. 3, 20, and 23 (which alone present difficulties, and of which the last two are certainly corrupt and must be in some way emended) should be so dealt with as to bring them into the fold of pure iambics. It has accordingly become incredible to me that c. 29 is not in pure iambic rhythm. Hence I must reject from the start all emendations that do not reduce these verses to this metrical form, as well as all that would present us with either Gaul or Britain in plural number (apparently historically impossible as early as the date of this poem, and certainly inconsistent with vv. 3, 4). Moreover *timere* in some form sounds right in v. 20, especially in contrast with *scit* of v. 19. With all necessary exclusions, then, there are still left a considerable number of ingenious guesses to choose from. It is partly because of the number that I venture to intrude my own, *timetque Gallia et timet Britannia*. I take it that *hunc* is in origin an interlinear gloss designed to furnish *timet* with a supposedly necessary object; in the next stage it displaced *timetque*, all the more easily because *timetque* appeared to repeat itself in *et timet*, which suffered inversion to supply the verb for *Gallia*. Or *hunc* may conceivably be a palaeographic corruption of *timet*. Instances of indubitable inversion of the order of words in the MSS. of Catullus, as well as of confusion of endings, are so common as not to need illustration. The collocation *que . . . et* is not suspicious. If I were to espouse any of the emendations made by others, it would be that of Friedrich, *Et hunc timentque Galliae et Britanniae*, but this itself emended to *Et hunc timetque* (or *timentque*) *Gallia et Britannia*. Of course Catullus has the plural *Syrias Britanniásque* in 45. 22, but there the meaning is clearly 'such lands as' those named.

In v. 3 I think *Māmurram* may safely be assumed, despite later usage. Even in 57. 2 (the only other place in Catullus where the name occurs) the first syllable may well be short.

29. 23 Eone nomine urbis opulentissime **GOR.**

Perhaps Schmidt's *urbis o putissimi* is what Catullus wrote; but the genitive (whether *urbis* or *orbis* be read) in this place, dependent upon some idea brought forward in the next verse, appears suspicious. If it can stand, I have yet sometimes wondered whether *putidissimi* were not the adjective that Catullus employed here. It is a peculiarly unsavoury word, and thus especially desirable to fling as a parting missile against these particular foes (cf. c. 57). But to read *urbis* (or *orbis*) *putidissimi* would add another to the few instances where critics have ascribed to Catullus the disregard of final -s in 'making position,' though c. 116. 8 *dabis* appears to be the only sure case of its sort. Another possibility of getting rid of the genitive and retaining *putidissimi* presents itself. Could *urbis* conceivably have been written as an explanatory gloss over (and after) *eone nomine*, while the initial *o-* (of *opulentissime* finally) was the common enough 'vocative sign' also inserted above? Thus Catullus might have written something like *eone nomine, heia putidissimi*. The chief trouble about juggling thus with interlinear glosses is that, by combination of the frequent stupidity of the original glossographers with the valiant courage of the modern emendators, almost any desired reading can be 'proved' in this fashion. But a number of places in **GOR** show beyond doubt that the complexion of their common Veronensian mother (or grandmother) was spotted with glosses, and that some of these have found a place in the *contextus*.

55. 9 Auelte (*corr. in aue te R*) sic ipse flagitabam **GOR.**

I venture to suggest *Te aulsum* for the impossible *Auelte* (of course supposing an inversion of order). *Flagitare* is used with a direct personal object by Plautus in the sense of summoning by a public crier, and the notion that Camerius has been carried off and is held in forcible concealment by the naughty girls is not at variance with the suggestion of v. 17 *tenent*.

62. 63 Tertia patris pars . est . data tertia matri **T** Tercia pars patri data tercia matri **GR** Tercia pars patri est data tercia matri **O.**

The authority of *Cod. Thuanus* in c. 62 is justly recognized, and Weber has suggested *tertia patris pars, pars est data tertia matri*. But it appears to me more likely that Catullus used the same construction in both clauses to express the natural right, and I should therefore prefer *tertia patri pars, pars est data terzia matri*.

63. 77 Leuumque **GR** lenumque **O** pectoris **GOR.**

Of course *laeuumque pecoris hostem* may be right, Cybele loosing this one of two lions merely because the 'nigh' animal is regularly the first to be freed from the yoke in ancient usage as in modern. Or there may be some other, unrecognized, possibly ritual reason for the designation. But I wonder whether

Catullus did not write *lentumque*: the lion, after all, is tame and well-broken; he does not readily return to a wild and fierce condition of temper on being turned loose; his sluggish good-nature needs the goad of Cybele's adjurations.

I have also been suspicious of *pecoris hostem*, chiefly because of the lack of really satisfactory parallel expressions. The customary Greek epithets of the lion as the 'bull-slayer' are all more specific and vigorous, and I am loath to believe that Catullus, who uses such lively and sonorous compounds in this poem, could not, if he had desired, have selected or concocted an equally pungent epithet here. But I am unable to suggest a suitable emendation that is not an arbitrary substitution. I have a little conscience left about over-working the interlinear gloss.

I may perhaps be permitted here to express dissent from the common feeling of editors that, Attis having once become feminine, the MSS. must be emended to keep him so. I would retain the masculines *excitum* (**GOR**) in v. 42 and *ipse* (**GOR**) in v. 45 (with Ellis), as well as *tenerum* (**GOR**) in v. 88 and *ille* (**GOR**) in v. 89. When Attis awakes from sleep, he does not at first realize his condition, and the natural masculines point to the confusion of memory. With the return of full consciousness the feminines also return in the verse, till Cybele, being herself of the feminine sex, does not deign to admit her devotee to that description, but refers to him by masculine pronouns (vv. 78, 80); and the masculines are naturally continued on this divine authority during the lion's rounding up. But the poet in the concluding summary of a single simple line leaves the feminine *famula* for the final impression.

64. 16 Illa alia O Illa atque alia **GR** (*punctum sub atque add. G<sup>2</sup>?*)

Lachmann's conjecture *illa si qua alia* comes nearest of all emendations thus far put forth to what I imagine Catullus wrote here. But it is open to one grave objection. The parallels cited for it appear to have reference to other instances of the given event that have already occurred, and thus furnish a precedent. But this voyage of the Argo is the first ship-voyage that ever took place; this vision of the sea-nymphs is the first that has ever greeted mortal eyes; and I am inclined to believe that the poet means us to understand also that no such sight was ever seen afterward. Yet both *illa* and *alia* sound right, nor is it easy to determine just what happened to mutilate the archetype. The word *atque* may of course be only an intruded gloss in the attempt to give sense to *illa alia*; but I have been influenced by it in venturing to suggest as a possible reading *illa (ecquanam alia?)*.

68. 116 Heb'2 nec O Hebe nec **GR**.

Ellis (even in his third edition), Schwabe, and, so far as I know, all editors except Baehrens have given up the puzzle offered by the peculiar abbreviation in O. Baehrens made a foolish guess. He failed to note the apostrophe after -b-, and set down *Heb'2* as '=Hebia, ut q<sub>2</sub>=quia,' though I think he could not have found q<sub>2</sub> for *quia* anywhere in **GOR**. The apostrophe after -b- is certain,

and plainly stands for a final *-e*, as, for example, in 17. 4 *palud'* (= *palude*) O (and also in 14. 5 *mal'* [= male] O, though GR have *malis*). But the *nota* following is unique in GOR. I have no doubt that it stood in *Veronensis* (which was certainly written in minuscules), whence O, with characteristic faithfulness, copied it as accurately as possible, though doubtless failing to understand it. But the immediate common archetype of GR left it out altogether, because it was unintelligible, and of course *Hebe nec* makes good sense. But the *nota* is surely for *et*, while *nec* is most likely for *ne* (or perhaps *nei*), as in 68. 103 (*ne G nec OR*), and in several other places in these MSS. of Catullus. Fleischer long ago conjectured *Hebe et ne* for *Hebe nec*, and I am inclined to think he was right, though I would put it on the ground of O's reading.

I have said that this *nota* is unique in GOR: but there is a trace yet remaining of its earlier occurrence in 64. 62, where the reading in O is *con* and in GR *et* (but apparently over an erasure of original *con*). The similarity of this *nota* for *et* to the inverted *c* (ɔ) for *con* could alone account for the variant readings here. (G<sup>2</sup> has written al'92 above *isque* in 66.55.)

#### 68. 118 tuum domitum GOR.

Nearly all the possible changes on *domitum*, *domitam*, *indomitum*, *indomitam* have been rung by emenders, and it may be superfluous to add another. But no one seems yet to have printed *te iam domitam*, which I suspect to be right. Catullus certainly cannot have represented Laodamia as a determined mantamer, but must rather have pictured her as yielding to the powerful sway of love. The feminine must be restored, and *te iam domitam* appears to me better than even the *te tum domitam* of Macnaghten or the *tum te domitam* of Friedrich.

#### 68. 157 et qui principio nobis terram dedit aufert GOR.

After these many years I am still in doubt about the interpretation of vv. 155-158, which, however, it seems to me must surely be understood to be in close connection of reference with vv. 67-69. The *domina* of v. 68 is surely the *domina* of v. 156, and she cannot be Lesbia for two reasons: (1) it is at best very doubtful whether a writer as early as Catullus could use *domina* as a love-name, and (2) the mention of his own mistress (Lesbia, of course) is reached in proper climax in vv. 159, 160. The *domina* must be the mistress of the house which by the kindness of Allius, who secured the sympathetic co-operation of its chatelaine, was put at the disposition of the lovers as a meeting-place. Again, it is Allius in vv. 67-69 to whom Catullus owes everything; Allius *clausum lato patefecit limite campum*; how can it be anyone else who *principio nobis terram dedit* (v. 157)? Or how can another person altogether (as some critics have suggested) be later brought into the sphere of blessing, and all happiness be said to date from him (v. 158)? Yet Allius has already had his benediction in *et tu simul et tua uita* (v. 155), and the return to the mention of him in v. 157 is not easily managed. *Et qui*, however, appears perfectly natural following the conjunctions of vv. 155, 156, and followed by that of v. 159.

As r  
strikes m  
graphical  
as a pos  
abfert, an  
be that t  
to the co  
who may

67. .

Thu  
Beltram  
1905) ar  
defence  
alia sup  
But I n  
when M  
antiqua  
treatise  
names o  
rememb  
Capreol  
ciently  
Commee

THE

As regards v. 157 *aufert*, the emendation *audens* proposed by Friedrich strikes me as the best thus far advanced, though if it were not for palaeographical considerations, I should prefer *audax*. But I have thought of *absens* as a possibility. Palaeographically it is easy: *absenſ* could readily become *abfert*, and *aufert* is the immediate correction. The necessary idea would then be that the house was that of Allius himself, who, being absent, turned it over to the control of the lovers, and gained for them the goodwill of its mistress, who may or may not have been the *tua uita* of v. 155.

67. 32sq.      Brixia Cygneae supposita speculae,  
                  Flauus quam molli percurrit flumine Melo.

Thus I am printing the verses, following the urgent judgment of A. Beltrami (*in Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche* II. 1, Roma, 1905) and Hugo Magnus (*Philologus* LXVI., 1907, p. 296), who argue in defence of the entire trustworthiness of Capreolus, whose statements *inter alia* support the MS. readings *percurrit* (OGR) and *Melo* (melo O mello GR). But I nevertheless do not more than half trust Capreolus. He died in 1519, when MSS. of Catullus had been scattered abroad for more than a century, and antiquarianism was rife. Is it not quite possible that we have to do in his treatise (or in the authority which he followed) with a sophisticated revival of names due to nothing further back than the current MSS. of Catullus? One remembers the famous case of the Grampian Hills in Scotland. (The text of Capreolus and of certain other moderns concerned in the same tradition is sufficiently quoted by Ellis in the Excursus to c. 67 in the second edition of his Commentary on Catullus.)

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

substit  
pede' is  
was de  
set aside

## OVIDIANA.

### TRIST. I 7 5-8.

hoc tibi dissimula, senti tamen, optime, dici,  
in digito qui me fersque refersque tuo  
effigiemque meam fuluo complexus in auro  
cara relegati, quae potes, ora uides.

5

THIS is the way to say in Latin 'you see my face, though you cannot see the rest of me'. So *her. X* 53 'tua, quae possum, pro te uestigia tango', 135 'non oculis sed, quae potes, aspice mente', *art. III* 633 'corpora si nequeunt, quae possunt, nomina tangunt', *trist. IV* 2 57 'haec ego summotus, quae possum, mente uidebo', 3 17 sq. 'esse tui memorem . . . quodque potest, secum nomen habere tuum', 10 112 'tristia, quo possum, carmine fata leuo', *ex Pont. IV* 4 45 'absentem, quae possum, mente uidebo'.<sup>1</sup> But that is not what Ovid seeks to say: he means 'you see my face in such fashion as you can', not in the flesh but in counterfeit presentment; and Latin expresses this meaning otherwise. As Ovid here speaks of his own likeness on a ring, so in *ex Pont. II* 8 55 he speaks of the likenesses of Augustus Tiberius and Liuia on a medal; and he says 'nos quoque uestra iuuat quod, quae licet, ora uidemus'. Arellius Fuscus in *Sen. suas. 4* 1 puts the same thought in the same way, 'cur non ab infantia rerum naturam deosque, quae licet, uisimus, cum pateant nobis sidera et interesse numinibus liceat?' In *her. XIII* 41 sq. 'quae possum, squalore tuos imitata labores | dicar' many MSS have changed the adverb into *quo* agreeing with the substantive hard by; and similarly here the 'quae potes' of the text has come from 'quae potes'.

And so read three of Heinsius' MSS, and so, with his usual rightness of instinct, did Heinsius, though he might have found it hard to formulate his reason, for his faculty of analysis was slight. The lection was adopted by Burman and remained the vulgate till in 1837 it collided with the density of Merkel, who thought he disposed of it by citing *trist. I* 1 16 'contingam certe quo licet illa *pede*'. That is a play upon two senses of the word *pes*; it means 'non meo *pede* sed uersum meorum *pede* siue metro'. To realise the futility of the parallel, try the experiment of substituting *qua* for *quo* in that verse. All sense will vanish, for *quo licet* is necessary to the definition of *pede*: if *quo* were removed, *pede* must be removed; if *qua* were substituted, it must be

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes *solus* is added, *met. I* 731 'quos II 10 47 'te tamen intueor quo solo pectora potuit solos, tollens ad sidera uultus', *ex Pont.* possum'.

substituted for *quo pede* and not for *quo*; and in fact 'contingam illa quo licet pede' is parallel, not to the 'uides cara relegati ora, quae potes' which Merkel was defending, but to the 'uides . . . ora, qua potes' which he was trying to set aside.

## TRIST. II 275-280.

275

sic igitur carmen, recta si mente legatur,  
constabit nulli posse nocere meum.  
[at quasdam uitio. quicumque hoc concipit, errat  
et nimium scriptis arrogat ille meis.]  
ut tamen hoc fatear, ludi quoque semina praebent  
nequitiae: tolli tota theatra iube. 280

277 *uicio L, uitiat HPV, quaedam uitia AG.* The sense is 'but it may be thought that I corrupt a matron here and there': *uitio* is 1st pers. sing. pres. indic. of *uitiare*. 'Who could mistake it for anything else?' asks the reader. A modern editor of Ovid. He would mistake it for the dative or ablative of *uitium*; he would enclose the words *at quasdam uitio* between inverted commas and put them into the mouth of Ovid's adversary; and he would explain the construction by an ellipse of *afficit* or of *uertisse meos libros arguunt*.

There is no reason to doubt that the couplet 277 sq. now stands as its author wrote it; but its author was not Ovid. Bentley's proposal to eject it was founded on the false readings current in his day; and when he adds 'quibus sublatis uide ut pulchre cohaerent reliqua', that, though a just observation, is not a compelling argument. But an argument which I find compelling is this: the point here raised,—that Ovid's *artes* may pervert individuals though not the whole class,—is a point which Ovid has met by anticipation. He has already said (257 sq.) 'quodcumque attigerit, si qua est studiosa sinistri, | ad uitium mores instruet inde suos' and (275 sq.) 'carmen, recta si mente legatur, | constabit nulli posse nocere meum': the virtuous will not be corrupted, the vicious will find corruption everywhere, in neither case is the poet a corrupter. The diction too is not above suspicion. *hoc concipit* may be defended by *met. II 76-8* 'forsitan et lucos illic urbesque deorum | concipias animo delubraque ditia donis | esse'; but the verb *arrogare* occurs neither in Ovid elsewhere nor in any poet except Horace, and the figurative use of *uitiare*, which properly means 'ravish' or 'seduce', is not Ovidian either. The distich was intruded, like 263 sq. 'persequar inferius, modo si licet ordine ferri, | posse nocere animis carminis omne genus', by a reader who could not follow Ovid's argument and flattered himself that he was making it clearer.

## TRIST. III 2 23 SQ.

ei mihi, quod totiens nostri pulsata sepulcri  
ianua sed nullo tempore aperta fuit.

The construction 'ei mihi, quod' occurs in Ovid half a dozen times, as at *trist. I 6 29* 'ei mihi, non magnas quod habent mea carmina uires'; the sense

is perfect, 'alas that death's door has never been opened to me though I have knocked at it so often'; the text stands thus in almost all the MSS; and thus it stood, I suppose, in every edition down to 1889.

But a little before that date Providence played the editors of Ovid a cruel trick: it put into their hands a 'best MS', and that was giving gunpowder to a child. In this passage L has *et* for *ei* and *quo* for *quod*. Not even the editors of Ovid were beguiled by the first of these corruptions, but the second they promptly accepted because they saw no reason why they should not: 'ei mihi, *quo* . . . fuit?' And how do they defend it? Mr Owen says 'cf. Ehwaldium, *Burs. nunt. annal.* XLIII p. 269'; thither we turn only to find Mr Ehwald saying 'cf. Vahlen, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.* 1883 S. 89'; and there at last we learn what is the matter, for Vahlen there cites four passages in which, if we take his word for it, *quo* means *cur*.

That *quo* means *cur* is an ambiguous proposition; for *cur*, like *why* in English, has more meanings than one. It means 'to what end', 'quo fine proposito', and it also means 'from what cause', 'qua causa efficiente'. The first of these senses is one which *quo*, originally 'whither', might be expected to acquire; and expectation is not disappointed: Verg. *buc.* VI 23 'quo uincula nectitis?', *Aen.* II 150 'quo molem hanc immanis equi statuere?', XI 735 'quo ferrum quidue haec gerimus tela inrita dextris?', XII 879 'quo uitam dedit aeternam?', Hor. *carm.* II 3 9-11 'quo pinus ingens albaque populus | umbram hospitalem consociare amant | ramis?', Prop. II 13 45 'nam quo tam dubiae seruetur spiritus horae?', Ouid. *met.* XIII 516 sq. 'quo ferrea resto | quidue moror?'. But it would be strange if *quo* acquired so alien a sense as 'qua causa efficiente'; and it did not acquire it. Where are the examples? I know that 'quo querimur flamas totum saeuuisse per orbem?' is the reading of G at Manil. I 744; but L has *quod* and M has *quid*, a word which really does mean *cur*. Again at II 534 sq., in a sentence which I take to be interrogative, G has 'quo mirer . . . nascentis . . . superari posse'; but L again gives *quod* and M *qd*, which the addition of a stroke corrects to *quid*. Apart from these I find one example only; and I find it, where you expect to find such things, in printed texts of Ovid: *amor.* III 7 19 sq.

a, pudet annorum! *quo* me iuuenemque uirumque  
nec iuuenem nec me sensit amica uirum?

That *quo* must mean 'from what cause' is here a minor wonder: the sentence is unconstruable: look at the two *me*'s! Riese put everything to rights by a proper punctuation:

a, pudet annorum! *quo* me iuuenemque uirumque?  
nec iuuenem nec me sensit amica uirum.

The construction is that of Val. Max. IX 13 ext. 2 'quo tam late patens imperium? quo tantum liberorum numerum?'

The reader should now be able to judge whether *quo* in *trist.* III 2 23 can mean, as it must if it is to be sense, 'what has brought it to pass that death is

denied me though I have provoked it so often?'. If it is to be Latin it must mean 'to what purpose is it'; and then it will not be sense. That Ovid stood in peril of robbers and shipwreck was an incident of exile; that he escaped them was a perversity of chance: there is no place for the notion of purpose.

## TRIST. III 4 71 SQ.

nec meus indicio latitantes uersus amicos  
protrahit: occulte, siquis a mabit, amet.

*amabit* scripsi, *amauit* GHPV cum plerisque, *amabat* L cum paucis. When the best MS gives *amabat* and the four next best *amauit*, nothing so well accounts for the facts as the hypothesis that the archetype had *amabit*. But the bondservants of a best MS are not concerned to account for facts, and L's reading is their reading. The case is the same at Iuu. VI 660: P gives *praegustabit*, and so consequently do the editors, but most other MSS have *praegustaret*: this divergency is best explained by Markland's conjecture *praegustarit*, which is now found in cod. Monac. 14466 and is supported by the *manducauerit* of the ancient scholia, whose authority is higher than P's.

The imperfect *amabat* is bad sense, since it implies that the persons in question have ceased to love. I do not pretend that *amabit* is better sense than *amauit* (I 9 26 'cum quis in aduersis, siquid *amauit*, amat'), but certainly it is no less good, for *occulte amet* can refer only to those friends whose friendship continues in the future. But Merkel and Ehwald so little understand what the sense is that they join *occulte* with *amabat*.

## TRIST. III 8 11 SQ.

stulte, quid haec frustra uotis puerilibus optas,  
quae non ulla tulit fertque feretque<sup>1</sup> dies?

'Fool, why idly and childishly yearning for what never was nor is nor will be?' The preceding context is this, 1-10: 'nunc ego Triptolemi cuperem consistere curru, . . . nunc ego Medeae uellem frenare dracones, . . . nunc ego iactandas optarem sumere pennas | siue tuas, Perseu, Daedale, siue tuas, | ut tenera nostris cedente uolatibus aura | aspicrem patriae dulce repente solum | desertaeque domus uultus memoresque sodales | caraque praecipue coniugis ora meae'. The ensuing context is this, 13-16: 'si semel optandum est, Augusti numen adora | et, quem sensisti, rite precare deum. | ille tibi pennasque potest currusque uolucres | tradere. det redditum, protinus ales eris.' Nothing therefore can be clearer than the sense of 'haec . . . quae non ulla tulit fertque feretque dies': it signifies the flying cars of Triptolemus and Medea and the wings of Perseus and Daedalus. And to make assurance doubly sure we have the parallel of *amor*. III 6 13-18 'nunc ego quas habuit pinnas Danaeius heros, | terribili densum cum tulit angue caput, | nunc opto currum de quo Cerealia primum | semina uenerunt in rude missa solum.'

<sup>1</sup> *refertque* most MSS, but the correction is recognised as certain.

prodigiosa loquor ueterum mendacia uatum : | nec tulit haec umquam nec feret ulla dies'. When I add that *tulit* in u. 12 is given by Ovid's best MSS and was printed by Ovid's best editor, the reader will surely wonder why it should be altered, and why, except for natural affinity, the inferior editors of our own day should print in its stead the *tibi* of the inferior MSS.

The cause appears to be Burman, for he, when *tulit* had been restored by Heinsius, expelled it again with this note : 'certe *tulit* aliquando dies ut uideret coniugem sodales etc., sed iam non fert nec feret dies'. Indeed? non *feret* dies ut uideat coniugem sodalesque? if Ovid says so, how can he look forward, as in 19 sq. of this very poem he does, to begging that very boon of Augustus? The future tense is alone enough to show that Burman was wrong in referring *haec* to the contents of the final clause 7-10; and from that mistake springs all the trouble. Merkel however, in accepting *tibi* from Burman, reveals another misunderstanding, which is his own : 'spectant ad illud (*tibi*) e sequentibus uerba *quem sensisti* (14). debilis esset ea ratio, si sibi opponerentur uanitas illa fabularum et sensus praesentioris numinis'. The opposition is not between 'uanitas fabularum' and *quem sensisti* but between 'uanitas fabularum' and *ille . . . pennas . . . potest . . . tradere* 15 sq.

## TRIST. III 11 61 sq.

crede mihi, si sit nobis collatus Vlixes,  
Neptunique minor, quam Louis, ira fuit.

This couplet, at present unconstruable, would become grammatical and yield a just sense if the conjunction *que* were removed from the pentameter; and how to remove it without wrecking the metre is the problem to which critics have hitherto addressed themselves. The violent effort of the inferior MSS, *Neptuni minor est*, will give a wrong sense unless it is subjected to a still more violent punctuation, 'Neptuni minor, est quam Louis, ira fuit'. Karl Schenkl's 'Neptuni minor, a!' is only fit for a schoolboy. Mr Owen has printed in three successive editions, spread over a space of 26 years, the distich 'crede mihi, si sit nobis collatus Vlixes, | Neptunine minor quam Louis ira fuit?' Crede mihi, Owenine peior ceteris conjectura est? The only proposal worth considering was made in 1890 by Robinson Ellis (*Hermathena* vol. VII p. 212) and again in 1894 by Mr I. Hilberg (*Wortstellung im pent. des Ovid* p. 198), 'Neptuni leuior, quam Louis, ira fuit'. The sense is right but the change not easy to explain: Mr Hilberg supposes that some reader wrote *minor* over *leuior*; but why?

I believe that all these shots are aimed at the wrong target; that the pentameter is sound and the hexameter will prove much more amenable to treatment. Our present text may easily have arisen from this:

si sit  
crede mihi, fel ix, nobis collatus, Vlixes,  
Neptunique minor, quam Louis, ira fuit.

*si sit* is an elucidation, like the *o* sometimes written over vocatives to show that they are not nominatives, and warns the reader that the participle *collatus* is equivalent to the protasis of a conditional sentence. So it often is: Prop. I 5 7 'non est illa uagis similis *conlata* puellis' (but I 4 9 'si leuibus fuerit *collata* figuris'), Varr. *l. L.* IX 28 'non bos ad bouem *collatus* similis?' X 36 'unaquaeque ratio, *collata* cum altera, aut similis aut dissimilis', Mart. XI 72 1 sq. 'drauci . . . , *conlatus* cui Gallus est Priapus', Liu. XXIX 17 5 'quid illa sunt, *conlata* cum eis quae hodie patimur?' and especially XLV 43 2 'minor ipse imperator . . . Anicius cum Aemilio . . . *conlatus*': Ovid himself *fast.* III 825 sq. has 'licet, antiquo manibus *conlatus* Epeo, | sit prior'. Pliny *ep.* III 5 19 uses the two modes of speaking side by side, 'si comparer illi, sum desidiosissimus' and 'quis . . . *collatus* illi non erubescat?' The counterpart of Ovid's *felix nobis collatus* occurs in Quint. *inst.* VI 2 22 'quam miser enim casus Andromachae, si, comparata ei, *felix* Polyxena'; and the same use of *felix* is found in *ex Pont.* I 2 29 'felicem Nioben' and *fast.* III 597 'Dido *felix* est dicta sorori'.

There is another verse of the *tristia* where an explanatory note has supplanted a word of the text: in III 13 1, 'quid enim fuit utile *gigni*', two of the best MSS, A and V, have *nobis* instead, which comes from *utile gigni*.<sup>nobis</sup> The usual correction of *remed.* 492 involves the same assumption. All MSS of any authority have

quamuis infelix media torreberis Aetna,  
frigidior dominae fac uideare tuae.

It is plain that 'frigidior' needs an ablative of comparison, and Heinsius borrowed from a couple of copies the reading

frigidior <glacie> fac uideare tuae.

*dominae* must then have been an explanation added to *tuae*. This correction however is not certain. It is true that 'frigidior glacie' occurs at *her.* I 22, X 32, and *ex Pont.* III 4 33 sq.; but in the last of these three places another comparison is found beside it, 'niuibus glacieque . . . frigidiora', and Ovid may well have written

frigidior dominae fac uideare n*iu*e.

He ends a pentameter with *niue* at *amor.* III 7 8 and *ex Pont.* II 5 38, and in the *remedias* and *artes* he so places *boue* (twice), *ope*, *pede* (twice, for I omit I 560), *dare*, *date*, *fuge*, *ego* (twice), *aqua* (three times), *toga*, and *forā*.

#### TRIST. III 14 47-50.

Threicio Scythicoque fere circumsonor ore  
et uideor Geticis scribere posse modis.  
crede mihi, timeo ne sint inmixta Latinis  
inque meis scriptis Pontica uerba legas. 50

The order of words in the last clause is a permissible equivalent for 'ne Pontica uerba sint inmixta Latinis inque meis scriptis (ea) legas'; but neither

the one nor the other is the diction of Ovid or of any Latin poet, even in exile among savages. A Latin would have inserted neither *sint* nor *que*, but would have said 'ne inmixta Latinis in meis scriptis Pontica uerba legas'. Where *sint* now stands there once stood an epithet of *uerba* which was joined with *Pontica* by *que*; and perhaps it is recoverable.

*Geticus* (48) is the adjective by which Ovid is accustomed to describe the immediate neighbourhood of Tomis. *Threicius* and *Scythicus* (47) describe the surrounding peoples. *Ponticus* (50) is a synonym of *Scythicus* (*Scythicus Pontus III 4 46 and IV 1 45*), and under *sint* (49) we may expect to find a synonym of *Threicius*.

Love of synecdoche impels Ovid, like other Latin poets, to use in a wide sense geographical terms whose proper meaning is narrow. When in speaking of his overland journey from Tempyra to Tomis at *ex Pont.* IV 5 35 he says 'sanguine *Bistonium* quod non tepefecerit ensem', he is not far from fact, for the Bistones were not far from Tempyra. But when ib. I 3 57-60 in describing his life at Tomis he says 'hostis adest dextra laeuaque a parte timendus, . . . altera *Bistonias* pars est sensura sarisas, | altera Sarmatica spicula missa manu', and when ib. I 2 108-10 in foreboding his death he says 'ossa nec a Scythica nostra premantur humo, | nec . . . *Bistonii* cineres ungula pulset equi', he is transferring the Bistones from the extreme south to the extreme north of Thrace. So again at *trist.* III 10 5 'Sauromatae cingunt, fera gens, *Bessique Getaeque*', IV 1 67 'uiuere quam miserum est inter *Bessosque Getasque*', when he says *Bessi* he means simply *Thraces*, not the Bessi proper, who dwelt south of Haemus. Now adjacent to the Bessi dwelt the Sinti on the Strymon. Strab. p. 331 fr. 36 ὁ Στρυμῶν ἔξ 'Αγριάνων . . . διὰ Μαΐδων καὶ Σιντῶν εἰς τὰ μεταξὺ Βισαλτῶν καὶ Οδομάρτων ἐκπίπτει, fr. 46 Σιντοὶ ἔθνος Θρακικόν, p. 549 Σιντιες . . . ἐκαλοῦντό τινες τῶν Θρακῶν, εἴτα Σιντοί, Arist. mirab. ausc. 115 τὴν τῶν Σιντῶν καὶ Μαΐδων χώραν καλούμενην τῆς Θράκης. The name of this people seems to have been elsewhere mentioned by Ovid and again corrupted by his scribes. In an allusion to his journey across Thrace, *trist.* IV 1 21 sq., the best MSS have 'sola nec insidias inter nec militis ensem | nec mare nec uentos barbariamque timet', where Mr Ehwald following a suggestion of Iac. Gronouius has proposed '*Sinti* nec *militis*'; and this conjecture gains support from a very similar error in Liu. XLII 51 6 'ab Heraclea ex *intris* (*Sintiis* *Grynaeus*, *Sintis* *Drakenborch*)'.<sup>1</sup>

The adjective is regularly *Σιντικός* and the district is thence called ἡ *Σιντική*, but Stephanus Byzantius has *Σιντία*, πόλις Μακεδονίας πρὸς τὴν Θράκη . . . λέγεται καὶ Σιντιοὶ καὶ Σιντιον τὸ οὐδέτερον; and though Aeschylus

<sup>1</sup> Ellis in *Hermath.* vol. VII pp. 191-3 absurdly confuses these *Σιντοί* with the *Σινδοί* dwelling in Asia on the eastern shore of the Euxine. There were other *Σινδοί* on the Hister, but apparently far inland, half way between the Euxine and the Adriatic, schol. Apoll. Rhod. IV 321 κατὰ δὲ τὸ τῶν Σινδῶν πεδίον σχίζεται ὁ ποταμὸς Ἰστρός, καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ βένειον εἰς τὸν Ἀδραν., τὸ δὲ εἰς τὸν

Εὔξεινον πόντον εἰσβάλλει; and I only mention them in order to bring together a pair of ἄπαξ εἰρημένα which ought to merge in one: Apoll. Rhod. IV 320-2 οὗτ' οὖν Θρήιξ μηγάδες Σκύθαι, οὐδὲ Σιγυνοι, | οὗτ' οὖν Γραυκένιοι, οὗτ' οἱ περὶ Λαύριον ήδη | Σινδοί έρημαδον πεδίον μέγα ναιεράντες τε καὶ Steph. Byz. Τραυχένιοι, έθνος περὶ τὸν πόντον τὸν Εὔξεινον, δυοροι Σινδοῖς.

says Μαιωτικός, Virgil says *Maeotius*. I suppose then that Ovid wrote what differs by one letter only from the MS text,

crede mihi, timeo ne Sintia mixta Latinis  
inque meis scriptis Pontica uerba legas.

*in meis scriptis ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*, like *met. XII 109 sq.* ‘Tenedonque suoque | Eetioneas inpleui sanguine Thebas’.

TRIST. V 2 23-27.

litora quot conchas, quot amoena rosaria flores  
quotue soporiferum grana papauer habet,  
silua feras quot alit, quot piscibus unda natatur,      25  
quot tenerum pennis aera pulsat ausi,  
tot premor aduersis.

*amoena rosaria*, though printed by all editors, is written only in the vulgar MSS: the better class, AGHPV (for L is absent), have *amoenos hostia* (*postia* A) instead. Now there are indeed many places where the worse MSS give a true reading and the better MSS a false one; but in those places we can generally find a cause for the error. Here there is no explaining how *amoena rosaria* can be the origin of anything so different and so difficult as *amoenos hostia*; whereas *amoenos hostia* would be corrected without scruple by the interpolators to whom the inferior MSS owe their inferiority, and *amoena rosaria* may very well be their correction. What I propose is less a correction than an interpretation of the more authentic text:

quot amoenos Ostia flores.

The neighbourhood of Ostia, which Minucius Felix 2 3 calls ‘amoenissima ciuitas,’ is still very gay with flowers in spring; and that this is no recent effort of Nature’s we learn from a document of the 6th century, the anonymous *cosmographia* printed on pp. 71-103 of Riese’s *geographi Latini minores*. There, p. 83 24-30, the island formed by the mouth of the Tiber is described in language as flowery as itself: ‘insula uero, quam facit inter urbis portum et *Ostiam* ciuitatem, tantae uiriditatis *amoenitatisque* est, ut neque aestiuis mensibus neque hiemalibus pasturae admirabiles herbas dehabeat; ita autem uernali tempore *rosa* uel *ceteris floribus* adimpletur, ut pro nimietate sui odoris et *floris* insula ipsa libanus almae Veneris nuncupetur.’ The *cosmographia* is edited by Riese from two MSS, one of the 8th and one of the 10th century: the latter, both in the passage just quoted and again at l. 22 of the same page, writes *Ostiam* as *hostiam*; and Ovid’s MSS, none of them older than the 13th century, have misspelt the word in the same way. Indeed the error is found in much more ancient authorities, at Min. Fel. 2 3 in the Parisinus (saec. IX), at Liu. XXII 11 6 in the Puteaneus (saec. V).

It may perhaps be thought that in this series of comparisons the common nouns *litora*, *papauer*, *silua*, *unda*, *aera*, should not be varied by a proper name, *Ostia*. But see *trist. V 131 sq.* ‘quot frutices *siluae*, quot flauas *Thybris* harenas, |

mollia quot *Martis* grama *Campus* habet', 6 37-40 'quam multa madidae celantur harundine fossae, | florida quam multas *Hybla* tuerit apes, | quam multae gracili *terrena* sub *horrea* ferre | limite formicae grana reperta solent', *ex Pont.* II 7 25-8 'Cinyphiae segetis citius numerabis aristas | altaque quam multis floreat *Hybla* thymis, | et quot aues motis nitantur in *aere* pinnis | quotque natent pisces *aequore* certus eris.'

## TRIST. V 8 1 sq.

non adeo cecidi, quamuis abiectus, ut infra  
te quoque sim, inferius quo nihil esse potest.

Lachmann at *Lucr.* I 159 remarked that three times in Ovid the last syllable of *nihil* is shown by metre to be long: *trist.* V 14 41 and *ex Pont.* III 1 113 'morte *nihil* opus est', *met.* VII 644 'in superis opus esse *nihil*, at in aedibus ingens'. He proposed to introduce a fourth example at *met.* X 520; but he might with better reason have cited and examined XIV 23 sq.,

nec medeare mihi sanesque haec uulnera mando;  
fineque nil opus est; partem ferat illa caloris.

The attachment of *que* to *ē* is not Ovidian, and the conjunction itself is both unnecessary and undesirable: Heinsius quotes from some MSS the reading *fine nihil opus est*, and this has in its favour the 'morte nihil opus est' of the *tristia* and *ex Ponto*, where such variants as *morteque nil opus est*, *at nece nil opus est*, *nil opus est leto*, are found in the MSS.

Lachmann further implies in his note on *Lucretius* and states explicitly in *Kl. Schr.* II p. 59 that there is no place in Ovid where the last syllable of *nihil* is shown by metre to be short: denying that Ovid wrote the epistle of Hero, he says 'hic uersus, si Nasonis est, in XIX, 170, *Exiguum*, sed plus quam *nihil*, illud erat, aut spondeum aut Creticum habet ubi non debet, quoniam hic poëta aliter non dixit quam aut *nil* una syllaba aut *nihil* altera producta.' Merkel in his *Ovid*, vol. I p. x, pointed out that Lachmann had overlooked *trist.* V 8 2 above; and Lucian Mueller, *d. r. m.* p. 47, added an example overlooked by both, *trist.* IV 8 38:

*mitius inmensus quo nihil orbis habet.*

This latter verse contains nothing suspicious unless *nihil* itself is so; though the transposition

*inmensus quo nil mitius orbis habet*

might be supported by *trist.* V 2 38 'Caesare *nil* ingens *mitius* *orbis* *habet*' and 8<sup>1</sup>25 sq. '*nil* ingens ad finem solis ab ortu | illo, cui paret, *mitius* *orbis* *habet*', and the error of the MSS, if error it is, might be compared with that of the cod. Erfurtanus at *ex Pont.* I 5 78, 'res *nihil* ista iuuat' for 'res iuuat ista *nihil*'. But the couplet *trist.* V 8 1 sq., apart from its *nihil*, is suspicious on general grounds. The unity of the poem would gain by its removal and is impaired by its presence; for the vehement contempt of these two verses is not explained, nor even continued, in the sequel. What follows is quite in another

vein : 3 sqq. 'quae tibi res animos in me facit, improbe, curue | casibus insultas quos potes ipse pati, | nec mala te reddunt mitem placidumque iacenti | nostra, quibus possint illacrimare ferae?' Instead of anything like 'non adeo cecidi . . . ut infra te . . . sim' we come to 10 'imposito calcas quid mea fata pede?' Instead of disdainful affronts we read appeals to considerations of prudence and humanity. The expostulation is bitter, but its tone is not heated or contemptuous. Verse 3 is well fitted to be the first of the poem; and verses 1 and 2 are such as might have been added by the obtuse reader who added so many to the Second book.

Mr Isidor Hilberg, by way of showing that 'Lachmann's Behauptung, Ovid gebrauche diese Silbe niemals als Kürze, widerspricht den Thatsachen', is good enough to cite on p. 745 of his *Wortstellung im pent. des Ovid* about a dozen such passages as *art. II* 280 'si nihil attuleris' and *fast. VI* 177 'nihil in pauone placebat'. He might easily have cited a dozen more: there are nine in the *tristia* alone. If Mr Hilberg means to learn prosody from the spelling of MSS, it will teach him terrible things. He will be dismayed to find that the last syllable of *nihil* is short even when the next word begins with a consonant. This verse, *Verg. buc. VIII* 103,

adgrediar; nihil ille deos, nihil carmina curat,

reposes on far surer testimony than any verse of Ovid, for it reposes on MPyac: the only one of Ribbeck's MSS which has *nihil* is *b*. None of Ovid's works is preserved in MSS so good as those which impute to Horace the verses 'Piplea dulcis nihil sine te mei', 'nihil interest an pauper et infima'; 'ab dis plura feret: nihil cupientium'. Mr Hilberg's observations are not merely infantile: they are the observations of an infant who has not read Lachmann's note. From Lachmann's note he might have learnt that Lucretius, if the spelling of MSS is evidence, wrote not only 'praeterea nihil est' but 'nihil semine egeret,' 'quorum nihil fieri', 'quia nihil est', and began hexameters with 'nihil tamen' and 'nihil igitur'.

Some editors even thrust *nihil* upon Ovid when the MSS do not. At *Ib. 284* the MSS have

cui nil rethei profuit ara Iouis.

So FGHVX, *nil etherei T, nichil etheli P*. Most of those who adopt the correction *Hercei* have seized the opportunity of importing *nihil*. Yet the rhythm of *cui nil Hercei* is quite good and common: 26 'pro tam mansueto', 37 'et uer autumno', etc.

#### TRIST V 13 1-6.

hanc tuus e Getico mittit tibi Naso salutem,  
mittere si quisquam, quo caret ipse, potest.  
aeger enim traxi contagia corpore mentis,  
libera tormento pars mihi nequa uacet,  
perque dies multos lateris cruciatibus uror,  
saeua quod inmodico frigore laesit hiems.

On the ground that *Getico* is everywhere else an adjective Daniel Heinsius proposed

hanc tuus e Getico mittit tibi Naso salutem  
litore, si quisquam, quo caret ipse, potest.

Gronouius *obs.* II c. 3 rejects the proposal: 'nam *Geticum* dixit, ut *Illyricum*, *Vindelicum*, *Noricum*, *Celticum* . . . dicebant'. But that is just what is not likely. Ovid uses no such form elsewhere, and these territorial names in *-icum* belong to the language of prose; they are not even found, where it would be less strange to find them, in the satirists. The *Illyricum* of Manil. IV 611 is an adjective in the MS text and was only turned into a substantive by the editors; and Claudian and Ausonius I do not count. On the other hand Ovid has '*Getico litore' trist.* III 12 4, '*Getici litoris*' I 10 14 and *ex Pont.* IV 4 8, '*litore ab Euxino Nasonis epistula ueni' trist.* V 4 1, 'haec mihi Cimmerio bis tertia ducitur aetas | litore' *ex Pont.* IV 10 1 sq., and the close parallels *ex Pont.* I 1 2 'hoc tibi de *Getico litore mittit opus*' and *trist.* V 1 sq. 'hunc quoque de *Getico*, nostri studiose, libellum | litore praemissis quattuor adde meis'. The substitution of *mittere* might be prompted by an untimely recollection of *ex Pont.* I 10 1 sq. 'Naso suo profugus mittit tibi, Flacce, salutem, | mittere rem si quis, qua caret ipse, potest'; and such a reminiscence has in fact caused the change of *si quisquam quo to rem si quis qua or si quis rem qua* in several of the inferior MSS. This sort of error is common in the *tristia* as elsewhere: thus at III 1 62, '*stricto barbarus ense pater*', some MSS, among them one of the best, have *stat ferus* from *art.* I 74. There can be no difficulty in supplying the infinitive *mittere* from the preceding *mittit* when *claudere* is supplied from the following *clausit in art.* II 53 '*aera non potuit Minos, alia omnia clausit*'.

The emendation of u. 6, *saeua quod immodico* for the *sed quod in immodico* or *sed quod non modico* of the MSS, is mentioned in his ed. of 1837 by Merkel, who ascribes it to Heinsius; in 1890 it was again proposed by Arthur Palmer, and in 1891, for the third time, by a German, to whom Mr Owen, after ignoring it in his first and second editions, now attributes it. But this conjecture does not destroy the continuity of a sentence nor deprive a transitive verb of its object; so Mr Owen still prefers his own conjecture *scilicet inmodico*, which does.

#### EX PONT. I 2 99-102.

di faciant igitur, quorum iustissimus ipse est,  
alma nihil maius Caesare terra ferat,  
utque diu sub eo sic sit sub Caesare terra,  
perque manus huius tradita gentis eat.

100

The rules of criticism are a very inadequate outfit for the practice of emendation, which is mainly an affair of natural aptitude and partly even of mere luck; but problems will now and then present themselves which the rules of criticism, with no aid from genius or fortune, are competent to solve. Such a problem is verse 101, and it ought therefore to have been solved by this time,

not molested by haphazard alterations of *diu* into *fuit* or *sub eo* into *saluo* or *sic sit sub Caesare terra* into *sit publica sarcina rerum*.

This verse not only suffers from the internal malady of making no sense, but also from an outward and visible disfigurement. Ovid cannot have meant to repeat the two words *Caesare terra* from the verse above, because the repetition serves no purpose; and he cannot have repeated them without meaning it, because the repetition could not be overlooked. Here then is the seat of the evil; and the field of enquiry can be further narrowed till all suspicion converges on the one word *terra*. First, it is useless: take it away, and neither grammar nor sense (or nonsense rather) is affected. Secondly, the presence of *Caesare* in both verses explains how *terra* got into the second, just as at *trist.* I 6 1 sq.

nec tantum Clario Lyde dilecta poetae  
nec tantum Coo Bittis amata suo est

the presence of *tantum* in both verses explains how it is that four of the five best MSS have *Clario* for *Coo* in the pentameter.

The injury, thus located by rule, can also be mended by rule. There is no room for the quackery which calls itself palaeographical emendation: to fill this gap,

utque diu sub eo sic sit sub Caesare -  $\Sigma$   
perque manus huius tradita gentis eat,

ask yourself only what sense and what part of speech the pentameter suggests and the rest of the hexameter requires. The lost word is an adverb answering *diu*:

utque diu sub eo sic sit sub Caesare <*semper*>.

*ut* and *sic* are  $\mu\acute{e}v$  and  $\delta\acute{e}$ : Ovid prays that earth may be ruled for many a year by Augustus himself and for all time by some one or other of his name, even as he augured in *trist.* IV 29 sq. 'qui Caesareo iuuenes sub nomine crescunt, | perpetuo terras ut domus illa regat.' This sense of the word *Caesar* has been missed by the commentators on Lucan at III 167 sq.

tristi spoliantur templa rapina  
pauperiorque fuit tunc primum Caesare Roma,

which they interpret as meaning that never till he robbed the treasury had C. Iulius been wealthier than the state: C. Iulius, whose debts and prodigality were a byword! What it does mean is that a spectacle grown familiar in Lucan's day, the spectacle of a Caesar richer than the commonwealth, was then witnessed for the first time.

It is the practice, or rather the instinct, of 'palaeographical emendators' to misrepresent scientific emendations; and their first impulse will be to describe this correction as a change of *terra* into *semper*, and to add a note of exclamation. Ignorant or unsuspecting readers, seeing no likeness between the two words, will then infer, as they are meant to infer, that the error was improbable and that the correction is violent. To spoil this game I subjoin a pair of examples. In Luc. V 192 the oldest MS, the Vienna palimpsest, instead of *tum maestus*, has *tum primum* from the *tum primum* of 190; and in Lucr. I 1023,

instead of *quaeque darent motus pepigere profecto* which Marullus restored from V 423, all MSS have *quaeque sagaci mente locarunt* from 1022. Again, *semper* has no more likeness to *ferto* than to *terra*; yet at *trist.* III 3 81, where the majority of good MSS have rightly *semper*, most MSS, including one of the best, have *ferto* in its place. There, as here, the error was due to no resemblance between word and word, but to a cause unconnected with palaeography.

## EX PONT. I 6 21-24.

nec breue nec tutum, peccati quae sit origo,  
scribere: tractari uulnera nostra timent.  
qualicumque modo mihi sint ea facta, rogare  
desine: non agites, siqua coire uelis.

Since *qualicumque* is not an interrogative word, the clause which it here introduces must be relative and must mean 'no matter how I got my wounds'; and then not only strict rule but Ovidian usage will require the indicative mood. Mr Ehwald *Krit. Beitr.* pp. 69 sq. accordingly changes *sint* to *sunt*. But interrogation, if forbidden by *qualicumque*, is demanded by *rogare*, which, now that the clause is relative, has neither a grammatical object nor an appropriate sense: the appropriate sense would be that of *tangere*, 'no matter how I got my wounds, let them alone'. I infer then that *sint* is right and *qualicumque* wrong. Now the best MS, the Hamburgensis A, three centuries older than the rest, has not *qualicumque* but *qualiacumque*, from which I elicit

qualia quoque modo mihi sint ea facta, rogare  
desine:

'ask not the nature of those wounds nor how I got them'. A similarly ungrammatical *cumque* is corrected to *quoque* by Lucian Mueller at *Priap.* 68 31 and to *quaeque* by me at *Lucr.* VI 85 and *Manil.* II 745 in my note on the latter verse.

## EX PONT. II 2 31-36.

tuta petant alii: fortuna miserrima tuta est,  
nam timor euentus deterioris abest.  
qui rapitur  
porrigit spinas dura quae saxa  
accipitremque timens pennis trepidantibus ales      35  
audet ad humanos fessa uenire sinus.

Verses 33 sq. are shown thus mutilated in A; B and C omit them altogether, and C covers the traces of this omission by altering *accipitremque timens* in 35 to *accipitrem metuens*; the inferior MSS on the other hand offer various completions of the distich. Most of these are absurdly wide of the required sense,—that men will incur a lesser evil in the hope of escaping a greater; but two 13th century copies, Lips. and Erfurt., present the verses thus,

qui rapitur <spumante salo (*Lips.*, freto *Erf.*), sua brachia tendens>  
porrigit <ad> spinas duraque saxa <manus>.

In the pentameter the supplements are probably true, but were easy to find by guessing: in the hexameter they are certainly false. What decisively condemns them is not the superfluity of *sua*, nor even the uselessness of *bracchia tendens* beside *porrigit manus*, but the word *salo* or *fretō*. When a man is drowning at sea, the only *spinae* to which he can stretch out his hands are those which grow on the backs of fishes: if he finds thorns to clutch at, he must be drowning in a river. And this is the picture drawn in a parallel passage, apparently an imitation, adduced by Korn from Sen. *ep.* 45: 'hoc cotidie meditare, ut possis aequo animo uitam relinquere, quam multi sic complectuntur et tenent, quomodo, qui aqua torrente rapiuntur, spinas et aspera'. Hence I conclude that the sense of what Ovid wrote was this:

qui rapitur <praeceps torrenti fluminis unda>  
porrigit ad spinas duraque saxa manus.

In u. 32 the two best MSS have *euentu*, which, though less natural than the genitive, may be defended as ablative of cause: 'eventus facit ut timor deterioris fortunae absit'. *trist.* I 9 16 'sunt tamen euentu uera fatenda meo' is not unlike.

EX PONT. II 5 8-12

diceris exiliis indoluisse meis,  
missaque ab Euxino legeres cum carmina Ponto  
illa tuus iuuit qualiacumque fauor,  
optastique breuem salu i mihi Caesaris iram,  
quod tamen<sup>1</sup> optari si sciat ipse sinat. 10

Early and late, conjectures have been showered on verse 11. For *salui* some inferior MSS offer *saluo*, others *fieri*; one scholar proposes *sancti*, another *statui*, a third *breui solui*; till anyone would think there really were something wrong. Yet all is well, and the conjectures are all aimed at the one word which must on no account be altered.

If *salui* is an obstacle, remove it, and mark the consequence. Ovid's friend will then have prayed that Caesar's anger against Ovid might be short; and this prayer contains not merely an ambiguity but a dangerous ambiguity. Even Virgil's innocent phrase 'tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum | concilia incertum est' did not escape malicious interpretation: *Seru. georg.* I 24 'male quidam culpant Vergilium, dicentes eum auditate laudandi citum interitum Augusto optasse': and 'optasti breuem mihi Caesaris iram' is much more like high treason, for one way to shorten Caesar's anger is to shorten Caesar's life. This implication is excluded by the addition of *salui*, which is part of the prayer: 'optasti breuem mihi Caesaris iram, ita tamen ut ipse saluus esset'. The exile took the same precaution at *trist. III* 1 57 sq., where his book, arrived before the house of Augustus, is made to say 'quando-cumque, precor, nostro placata parenti | isdem sub dominis aspicere domus':

<sup>1</sup> Since *tamen* is a word so often misunderstood, sciat, tamen sinat', 'would permit, even if he I had better say that the construction is 'si knew'.

he does not wish to purchase pardon and recall at the price of the emperor's decease. The passage cited by Heinsius, *ex Pont.* II 397 sq. 'precabor | ut tibi sit saluo Caesare salua parens', though no parallel in point of sense, is similar in expression, for it is a way of saying 'ut et Caesar et parens tua salua sit'.

Perhaps we shall now be able to defend what is right and amend what is wrong in the MS tradition of *met.* XV 838, where the prophecy of Augustus' reign concludes with these words:

nec nisi cum senior similes aequauerit annos  
aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget.

Neither *similes* nor *aequauerit* has any sense, for there is nothing in the context to which the years of Augustus' life can either be likened or equalled. Heinsius, comparing *ex Pont.* II 841 sq. 'sic pater in Pylios, Cumaeos mater in annos | uiuant' and *trist.* V 561 sq. 'Caesar dis accessure, sed olim, | aequarent Pylios cum tua fata dies', altered *similes* to *Pylios*; and this conjecture, despite its violence, is adopted by the latest editors. But what then possessed the poet to add *senior*? If a man is to die as old as Nestor and outlive three generations of his fellows, what need to tell us that he will then be well stricken in years? Ovid added *senior* because he was using a phrase which without *senior* would have been ambiguous: *similes* has usurped the place of a dative, probably

nec nisi cum senior meritis aequauerit annos.

To foretell that Augustus will quit the earth only when his years are as many as his good deeds is not necessarily to foretell him a long life: the number of his good deeds may be matter of opinion, and if T. Labienus heard that prophecy and put faith in it he would expect Augustus to drop down dead on the spot. Ovid therefore takes care to preclude all suspicion of a double meaning. *meritis* differs in two letters only from *mesilis*, which differs from *similes* only in the order of letters: compare such changes as *met.* XIII 624 *patrem (patrem) templa*, XIV 233 *lami (sami) imas*.

#### EX PONT. II 6 19-24.

turpe erit in miseris ueteri tibi rebus amico auxilium nulla parte tulisse tuum.	20
turpe referre pedem nec passu stare tenaci, turpe laborantem deseruisse ratem :	
turpe sequi casum et fortunae accedere amicum et, nisi sit felix, esse negare suum.	

So I punctuate, with a full stop after 20 and a colon after 22. Heinsius put full stops in both places, and then proposed, no wonder, to delete 23 sq.; Merkel ended both 20 and 22 with colons, which makes no difference and leaves 23 sq. no less intolerable. Korn placed a colon after the first distich, a full stop after the second, and deleted the third; and Guethling, rejecting the

deletion and yet accepting the punctuation, reduced the passage to the worst plight in which it has yet been seen.

What Guethling conceived I cannot guess; but it seems clear that the other editors repeat *erit tibi* from 19 with the *turpe's* of 21 and 22 and 23, so that the three distichs form a series in which each member stands on an equal footing: then, to be sure, the third distich is flat after the second and futile after the first, and the *suum* of 24 ought to be *tuum*, which some MSS accordingly substitute.<sup>1</sup> With my punctuation the passage ought to interpret itself. *turpe* in 21 and the following verses is not *turpe tibi erit* but *turpe est*; verse 21 is to be introduced with *μὲν γάρ* and verse 23 with *δέ*. ‘It will be shame to you if you do not help an old friend in his trouble; for, even as it is shame to retire in battle or to abandon a labouring ship, so is it shame to be led by luck, to transfer one’s friendship to fortune, and to disown a comrade except he be prosperous’. The verses 21-24 are a general reflexion enforcing the personal monition of 19 sq.; and the distich 21 sq. is related to the distich 23 sq. as ‘*triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbræ, | arboribus uenti*’ to ‘*nobis Amaryllidos iræ*’ in *Verg. buc. III 80 sq.* The subject of *sit* and *esse* in 24 is the other party whose existence is necessarily implied when the talk is of friendship: similarly *diligit* has no expressed subject in *Cic. de inu. II 166* ‘*amicitia (est) uoluntas erga aliquem rerum bonarum illius ipsius causa, quem diligit, cum eius pari uoluntate*’.

EX PONT. II 7 1-4.

esse salutatum uult te mea littera primum  
a male pacatis, Attice, missa Getis.  
proxima subsequitur, quid agas, audire uoluntas,  
et si, quidquid agis, sit tibi cura mei.

For *uoluntas* in u. 3 the best MSS give *uoluptas*, which Heinsius brought into the text without a word of explanation, which Merkel, merely because of the MSS, retained, and which his followers accepted merely because of Merkel. Vahlen in 1881, *über die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid* p. 33 n. 1, justly observed ‘*uoluptas* giebt keinen Sinn, *uoluntas* den besten’; but there he would have been wise to stop. When he went on to explain what he supposed this best of senses to be, he showed that he did not comprehend it: ‘das erste ist mein Gruss (*salus*), das zweite mein Wunsch (*uoluntas*) zu erfahren, wie es dir geht und ob du meiner eingedenk bist’. That this is not the sense, and that no contrast exists between *salutatum* in the one verse and *uoluntas* in the other, Ovid has tried to make plain by mentioning his *uoluntas* in both verses; for *uult primum* is the same as *prima uoluntas est*, and *proxima subsequitur uoluntas* is the same as *secundo loco uult*. The contrast is between *te salutatum esse* and

<sup>1</sup> Mr Owen, who has Merkel’s punctuation, says ‘*sed cf. I 3 2*’. In another editor one would suppose this to be a slip of the pen for *trist.* I 5 2, which is less obviously irrelevant; but Mr Owen probably means what he has written, *ex Pont. I 3 2*, ‘qui miser est, ulli si suus esse potest’, for he has similar notes elsewhere: at I 4 46 he refers to 5 28, at I 10 22 to *Ib.* 150 (152), at III 5 29 to 50, at IV 6 15 to *Liu. XXII* 4 4, and at *trist.* IV 1 10 to *Verg. georg.* IV 313.

he does not wish to purchase pardon and recall at the price of the emperor's decease. The passage cited by Heinsius, *ex Pont.* II 3 97 sq. 'precabor | ut tibi sit saluo Caesare salua parens', though no parallel in point of sense, is similar in expression, for it is a way of saying 'ut et Caesar et parens tua salua sit'.

Perhaps we shall now be able to defend what is right and amend what is wrong in the MS tradition of *met.* XV 838, where the prophecy of Augustus' reign concludes with these words:

nec nisi cum senior similes aequauerit annos  
aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget.

Neither *similes* nor *aequauerit* has any sense, for there is nothing in the context to which the years of Augustus' life can either be likened or equalled. Heinsius, comparing *ex Pont.* II 8 41 sq. 'sic pater in Pylios, Cumaeos mater in annos | uiuant' and *trist.* V 5 61 sq. 'Caesar dis accessure, sed olim, | aequarint Pylios cum tua fata dies', altered *similes* to *Pylios*; and this conjecture, despite its violence, is adopted by the latest editors. But what then possessed the poet to add *senior*? If a man is to die as old as Nestor and outlive three generations of his fellows, what need to tell us that he will then be well stricken in years? Ovid added *senior* because he was using a phrase which without *senior* would have been ambiguous: *similes* has usurped the place of a dative, probably

nec nisi cum senior meritis aequauerit annos.

To foretell that Augustus will quit the earth only when his years are as many as his good deeds is not necessarily to foretell him a long life: the number of his good deeds may be matter of opinion, and if T. Labienus heard that prophecy and put faith in it he would expect Augustus to drop down dead on the spot. Ovid therefore takes care to preclude all suspicion of a double meaning. *meritis* differs in two letters only from *mesilis*, which differs from *similes* only in the order of letters: compare such changes as *met.* XIII 624 *patrem (patlem) templa*, XIV 233 *lami (sami) imas*.

#### EX PONT. II 6 19-24.

turpe erit in miseris ueteri tibi rebus amico auxilium nulla parte tulisse tuum.	20
turpe referre pedem nec passu stare tenaci, turpe laborantem deseruisse ratem :	
turpe sequi casum et fortunae accedere amicum et, nisi sit felix, esse negare suum.	

So I punctuate, with a full stop after 20 and a colon after 22. Heinsius put full stops in both places, and then proposed, no wonder, to delete 23 sq.; Merkel ended both 20 and 22 with colons, which makes no difference and leaves 23 sq. no less intolerable. Korn placed a colon after the first distich, a full stop after the second, and deleted the third; and Guethling, rejecting the

deletion and yet accepting the punctuation, reduced the passage to the worst plight in which it has yet been seen.

What Guethling conceived I cannot guess; but it seems clear that the other editors repeat *erit tibi* from 19 with the *turpe's* of 21 and 22 and 23, so that the three distichs form a series in which each member stands on an equal footing: then, to be sure, the third distich is flat after the second and futile after the first, and the *suum* of 24 ought to be *tuum*, which some MSS accordingly substitute.<sup>1</sup> With my punctuation the passage ought to interpret itself. *turpe* in 21 and the following verses is not *turpe tibi erit* but *turpe est*; verse 21 is to be introduced with *μὲν γάρ* and verse 23 with *δέ*. ‘It will be shame to you if you do not help an old friend in his trouble; for, even as it is shame to retire in battle or to abandon a labouring ship, so is it shame to be led by luck, to transfer one's friendship to fortune, and to disown a comrade except he be prosperous’. The verses 21-24 are a general reflexion enforcing the personal monition of 19 sq.; and the distich 21 sq. is related to the distich 23 sq. as ‘*triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbris, | arboribus uenti*’ to ‘*nobis Amaryllidos irae*’ in Verg. *buc.* III 80 sq. The subject of *sit* and *esse* in 24 is the other party whose existence is necessarily implied when the talk is of friendship: similarly *diligit* has no expressed subject in Cic. *de inu.* II 166 ‘*amicitia (est) uoluntas erga aliquem rerum bonarum illius ipsius causa, quem diligit, cum eius pari uoluntate*’.

EX PONT. II 7 1-4.

esse salutatum uult te mea littera primum  
a male pacatis, Attice, missa Getis.  
proxima subsequitur, quid agas, audire uoluntas,  
et si, quidquid agis, sit tibi cura mei.

For *uoluntas* in u. 3 the best MSS give *uoluptas*, which Heinsius brought into the text without a word of explanation, which Merkel, merely because of the MSS, retained, and which his followers accepted merely because of Merkel. Vahlen in 1881, *über die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid* p. 33 n. 1, justly observed ‘*uoluptas* giebt keinen Sinn, *uoluntas* den besten’; but there he would have been wise to stop. When he went on to explain what he supposed this best of senses to be, he showed that he did not comprehend it: ‘das erste ist mein Gruss (*salus*), das zweite mein Wunsch (*uoluntas*) zu erfahren, wie es dir geht und ob du meiner eingedenk bist’. That this is not the sense, and that no contrast exists between *salutatum* in the one verse and *uoluntas* in the other, Ovid has tried to make plain by mentioning his *uoluntas* in both verses; for *uult primum* is the same as *prima uoluntas est*, and *proxima subsequitur uoluntas* is the same as *secundo loco uult*. The contrast is between *te salutatum esse* and

<sup>1</sup> Mr Owen, who has Merkel's punctuation, says ‘*sed cf. I 3 2*’. In another editor one would suppose this to be a slip of the pen for *trist.* I 5 2, which is less obviously irrelevant; but Mr Owen probably means what he has

written, *ex Pont.* I 3 2, ‘qui miser est, ulli si suis esse potest’, for he has similar notes elsewhere: at I 4 46 he refers to 5 28, at I 10 22 to *Ib.* 150 (152), at III 5 29 to 50, at IV 6 15 to Liu. XXII 4 4, and at *trist.* IV 1 10 to Verg. *georg.* IV 313.

*audire quid agas et si sit tibi cura mei*; and the sense is ‘primum te salutatum uolo, deinde uolo audire quid agas’.

## EX PONT. II 8 71-76.

aut ego me fallo nimiaque cupidine ludor  
aut spes exilii commodioris adest.  
nam minus et minus est facies in imagine tristis  
uisaque sunt dictis adnuere ora meis.  
uerā precor fiant timidae praesagia mentis,  
iustaque quamuis est sit minor ira dei. 75

The proposal, now generally approved, of Mr Hilberg in his *Wortstellung im pent. des Ovid*, p. 4, to corrupt the last verse thus,

iustaque, quam uisa est, sit minor ira dei,

is one of those false conjectures which have more luck in the world than most of the true. The metre of the verse as it stands is said to be objectionable. Suppose that the objection is just: it is a pity if the metre cannot be mended without spoiling the sense.

Ovid has received from his friend Cotta a silver medal or other work of art representing Augustus, Tiberius, and Liuia. He finds in the face of Augustus a trace of anger, 21 sq. ‘fallor, an irati mihi sunt in imagine uultus | toruaque nescioquid forma minantis habet?’; but now, 73 sq., the graven countenance seems to grow milder, ‘minus est facies in imagine tristis’ etc. Mr Hilberg will have it that the *quam uisa est* of his pentameter looks back to 21 sq. It cannot possibly look back to anything but the *uisa sunt adnuere ora* of the immediately preceding couplet 73 sq.; and it therefore gives a false sense: sense requires *sicut uisa est*, not *quam*. If *quam* is right, *uisa est* will be wrong, and sense will require *quam fuit*, as in III 198 ‘sit ut iratum, quam fuit ante, minus’.

And what fault has the metre that must thus be cured at the cost of the meaning? A second foot consisting of a single spondaic word, says Mr Hilberg. It is true that such verses as

hanc tibi cuius me magnus edebat amor

are not found between Catullus and Paulinus; but this is not such a verse, for *quamuis* is not a single word. Ordinarily it counts as one, and so does *internos*, as in Ouid. *art. II 612* ‘sed sic internos ut latuisse uelint’; but *internos* likewise, being two words, is once treated as two, in Mart. *spect. 18 6* ‘postquam *internos* est, plus feritatis habet’. *nequis* again, by the punctuation of the oldest inscriptions, is not two words but one, and accordingly the poets do not scruple to place it in the fifth foot of the hexameter and before the last iambus of the pentameter, as at Verg. *Aen. II 606* ‘nequa parentis’, III 473 ‘nequa ferenti’, VIII 205 ‘nequid inausum’, Ouid. *trist. V 13 4* ‘nequa

tatum  
5  
ellung  
most  
able.  
ended  
ark of  
ce of  
imagine  
, the  
stis'  
ooks  
unt  
before  
ight,  
it ut  
f the  
Mr  
  
, for  
does  
rmos  
ost-  
n of  
s do  
last  
473  
qua

uacet';<sup>1</sup> but it is two words in Prop. IV 56 'utere, nequid cras libet ab ore dies'. *uis* and *libet* stand apart from their relative in Cat. agr. cult. 52 2 'quod genus *uis propagabis*', 158 2 'unum quod eorum *uis*', and Sall. Cat. 54 'cuius rei *libet simulator*'; and here in Ovid, under stress of metre, the compound remembers its composition and resolves itself into its components. The MSS even offer another example, *trist.* V 9 25 sq.

nunc quoque, *quamuis* est iam iussa quiescere, quin te  
nominet inuitum, uix mea Musa tenet.

Here however something is wrong, for *tenet* requires an object. Editors write *se quamuis est iussa* with Naugerius: in some respects there is more to be said for Mr Owen's suggestion that *tenet* has come from the end of 28 and has ousted *potest*; but it must be allowed that *iam* in the hexameter is devoid of force.

The fact that *postquam*, like *quamuis*, is two words renders just endurable the rhythm of *her.* XV 113

*postquam se dolor inuenit, nec pectora plangi,*  
which otherwise would be harsher even than *ex Pont.* IV 9 99 'illi me, quia  
uelle uident, discedere malunt' and without a parallel in Ovid. But even so it  
is harsh, much beyond *her.* II 37 'perque tuum mihi iurasti', *amor.* III 1 25,  
'materia premis ingenium', 9 53 'cumque tuis sua iunxerunt'.

#### EX PONT. III 4 17-20

spectatum uates alii scripsere triumphum:  
est aliquid memori uisa notare manu.  
nos ea uix aidam uulgo captata per aurem  
scripsimus, atque oculi fama fuere mei.

20

20 *scripsimus* edd.; but most MSS, including C, the best here legible, have *uidimus*, and B, the best here extant, shows *scripsimus* written by the second hand in an erasure. *uidimus* is plainly corrupt, but it is not plainly nor even probably a corruption of *scripsimus*; while *scripsimus* may easily be a correction of *uidimus*, suggested by *scripsere* in 17. I propose *nouimus* instead. If the first two letters were lost in the margin, *uimus*, especially with *uisa* standing in 18, might be expanded into *uidimus*, just as *ueri* (*ui*) in *trist.* IV 1 66 has been expanded into *uidi*, or, to take an instance yet more similar, as *iu-nit* at the beginning of *Ib.* 488 has been changed in most MSS to *uidit*.

#### EX PONT. III 4 63 SQ.

quid mirum, lectis exhausto floribus horto,  
si duce non facta est digna corona suo?

Ovid has indited a poem on Tiberius' triumph of January A.D. 13, but

<sup>1</sup> So also *amor.* III 4 32 'siqua potest', *art.* III 466 'siqua negat', *rem.* 330 'siqua proba est'. There are in Ovid only two pentameters where a pair of monosyllables stands in this position, *rem.* 306 'non dat habet' and *ex Pont.* I 1 14 'non sit amor'; to which the spurious epistles add two more, *her.* XVIII 170 'qua sit iter' and XX 62 'par sit opus'.

other poets, less remote from the scene, have forestalled him; they have stripped the garden of flowers and left him none from which to twine a worthy wreath. Instead of *duce . . . suo* Merkel in 1884 printed *uice . . . sua*: this made Messrs Owen and Ehwald suppose that something was amiss, and they both conjectured, as they naturally would, *duce . . . tuo*. ‘Die Elegie ist an Rufinus gerichtet’ says Mr Ehwald ‘und handelt vom Triumph des Germanicus,’—he means Tiberius, but no matter,—‘also ist zu schreiben: *quid mirum . . . si duce non facta est digna corona tuo? tuus dux* ist eben Germanicus’. A pretty description of Tiberius, or Germanicus either, to call him *dux Rufini*, the chief of one civilian! Let *suo* be as false as you will, *tuo* cannot be true; but why is *suo* false? Mr Ehwald, *Krit. Beitr.* p. 40, says that the text is impossible ‘da *suo* absolut beziehungslos steht: denn der *dux suus* kann doch unmöglich durch den *lectis exhaustus floribus hortus* erklärt werden . . . der *hortus* ist . . . kein Besitzstück des *dux*, sondern gehört den Dichtern.’ Of course it does: what belongs to the *dux* is the *corona*, and it is to *corona* that *suo* refers. Better critics than Mr Ehwald have before now proposed alterations just as false and needless, because they have not rightly conceived the nature and observed the usage of the Latin possessive pronoun. The relation which it signifies is a mutual relation, for which possession is often no appropriate name: two objects may so appertain to one another that *suus* can properly be attached to either of them. At *her. XIV* 67 we find ‘*lacrimae sua uerba sequuntur*'; at *XX* 76 on the contrary ‘*liceat lacrimis addere uerba suis*', whereupon most MSS substitute *meis* and one editor *sua*; but the tears suit the words just as the words suit the tears. Virgil *georg.* IV 190 has ‘*fessosque sopor suus occupat artus*', Ovid *met.* VI 489 ‘*placido dantur sua corpora somno*'; sleep and the body are joined in a natural union and each is apportioned to the other. We speak in English of crime and its punishment, not of punishment and its crime; but Ovid *trist.* II 578 says ‘*ut par delicto sit mea poena suo*'. We speak of the leek and its leaves, not of leaves and their leek; but Martial XI 52 6 says ‘*porris fila resecta suis*'. We speak of the face and its beard, not of the beard and its face; but Martial IX 76 4 says ‘*gaudebatque suas pingere barba genas*'. So again he has I 111 1 sq. ‘*cum tibi sit sophiae par fama et cura deorum, | ingenio pietas nec minor ipsa suo*', i.e. to which it is linked; so Manilius IV 912 ‘*trepidaeque suo sub pectore fibrae*', the breast which is their seat, where Bentley conjectured *boum*; so Ovid *ex Pont.* III 9 22 ‘*cumque suo crescens pectore feruet opus*', the heart or brain from which the poem issues forth. Finally in *ex Pont.* III 8 14 ‘*nulla premunt ramos pondere poma suos*' some MSS and editors substitute *suo*; but *ramos suos* means the boughs where the fruit should rightly grow. And even so with III 4 64: ‘the flowers are plucked and the garden rifled; what marvel then if I have twined no garland worthy of the victor for whose brows it was meant?’

## EX PONT. IV 16 31-34.

cum Varus Graccusque darent fera dicta tyrannis,  
 Callimachi Proculus molle teneret iter,  
 Tityron antiquas Passerque rediret ad herbas,  
 aptaque uenanti Grattius arma daret, . . .

'Verdorben und noch nicht geheilt ist Pont. IV 16 33 *Tityron antiquas passerque rediret ad herbas*' says Teuffel's *Gesch. d. Röm. Lit.* § 252 12 even in the last edition (1910); and so, even in the last edition (1911), says Schanz's, § 314. Yet Riese emended the verse in 1874 by simply printing *passer* with a capital. The name is known to us from Varr. *r.r.* III 2 2 'M. Petronius Passer', and this bearer of the name is as well known to us as Proculus in the line above, Numa in 10, Marius in 24, Luper in 26, Turranus in 29, Fontanus in 35, or Capella in 36: he is mentioned only in this elegy, and so are they. He wrote bucolics, or, as Ovid puts it, he went back to Tityrus and the pastures of old, the traditional shepherd and the country life of a bygone age: Paul. *Fest.* p. 99 'antiquae et pastoralis uitiae indicium'. The only difficulty is the order of the words; and this Riese failed to defend, because he did not analyse its complexity. His examples *ex Pont.* III 6 48 and *Ib.* 576 illustrate nothing but the postponement of the conjunction, and *trist.* IV 5 31 sq. 'sic iuuenis similisque tibi sit natus et illum | moribus agnoscat quilibet esse tuum' does not even illustrate this, for *que* and *et* must there answer one another like *te* and *καὶ*.

The construction is 'cum Passer rediret ad Tityron antiquas herbas'. Propertius would have written

Tityron antiquasque rediret Passer ad herbas,

as he wrote 'cum te iussit habere puellam cornua Iuno' and 'et grauiora rependit inquis pensa quasillis'; but Ovid disliked this rhythm more than he disliked entanglements of words. Here he has resorted to no fewer than three artificial dislocations, each of them legitimate, but not perhaps elsewhere assembled in a single verse.

For the delay of the preposition, 'Tityron antiquasque ad herbas' for 'ad Tityron antiquasque herbas', see such examples as Verg. *Aen.* V 512 'illa notos atque alta uolans in nubila fugit', Ouid. *her.* VI 107 sq. 'illa sibi Tanai Scythiaeque paludibus uade | quaerat et a ripa Phasidis usque uirum', met. VII 708 'pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore', Val. *Fl.* I 716 sq. 'non Scythicas ferus ille domos nec ad ostia Ponti | tendit iter', Sil. XIV 2 'Ortygiae pelagus Siculique ad litoris urbes'.

The postponement of the conjunction, 'antiquas . . . que', is commoner; but take for instance Hor. *carm.* IV 2 21 sq. 'flebili sponsae iuuenemue raptum | plorat', Ouid. *met.* XIV 30 'poteras certeque', *Ib.* 451 'uulnera totque feras', *fast.* IV 609 sq. 'indoluit . . . maesta parens, longa uixque refecta mora est', *ex Pont.* II 1 5 sq. serenum | uidi, fortunae uerba dedique meae': one example, *ex Pont.* III 6 48 'cesserat omne nouis consiliumque malis', is

especially significant, since Ovid could have avoided the postponement if he had cared by writing 'consilium nouis cesserat omne malis'.

The construction 'Tityron antiquas Passerque rediret ad herbas' for 'Passer rediret Tityron antiquasque ad herbas' or 'Tityron antiquasque ad herbas Passer rediret' is of the sort called *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* and typified by Hor. *carm. II* 19 32 'pedes tetigitque crura'. Most commonly it is the verb alone which is thus dislocated; but sometimes the subject, as in *Lucr. V* 214 'frondent atque omnia florent', *Tib. I* 6 81 sq. 'hanc animo gaudente uident iuuenumque cateruae | commemorant merito tot mala ferre senem', *Ouid. her. II* 70 'tauri mixtaque forma uiri', *XVIII* 32 'aut uidet aut acies nostra uidere putat', *Sen. H. f. 1213* sq. 'in se coibunt saxaque in caelum expriment . . . mare'; and sometimes, as here, the verb with its subject or object or both: Hor. *carm. I* 11 4 'seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam', *Manil. II* 325 sq. 'summa prioris | et pars confertur subiuncti prima', *V* 479 'tacito gestu referetque affectibus orsa', *Tib. I* 2 39 sq. 'is sanguine natam, | is Venerem e rabido sentiet esse mari', *Ouid. amor. III* 7 20 'nec iuuenem nec me sensit amica uirum'.

The combination of the construction *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* with the postponement of a conjunction is natural and simple enough in such an example as *Tib. I* 3 56 'Messallam terra dum sequiturque mari', where both the two words preceding the *que* are *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* and pertain equally to *terra* and to *mari*. A complication is added if one word is *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* and the other is not, as may seem to be the case with our 'antiquas Passerque'. But this too has parallels: *Tib. II* 3 12 'nec cithara intonsae profueruntque comae', *Ouid. trist. V* 1 46 'barbariam rigidos effugiamque Getas', *ex Pont. IV* 9 42 'praetextam fasces aspiciamque tuos'. And possibly, nay probably, *antiquas* itself is *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*. Epithets are often thus placed: *Verg. catal. 13* 5 'ualent mihi ira et antiquus furor', *Hor. epist. I* 17 57 'nulla fides damnis uerisque doloribus adsit', *Ouid. art. II* 108 'quod tibi non facies solaue forma dabit'; and this position is present, and softens the postponement of the conjunction, in *Tib. II* 5 22 'Ilion ardentes respiceretque deos' (ardentem Ilion ardentesque deos), 86 'dolia dum magni deficiantque lacus' (magna dolia), 111 sq. 'uersus mihi nullus | uerba potest iustos aut reperire pedes' (iusta uerba). Similarly Ovid may here be saying 'Passer rediret ad antiquum Tityron antiquasque herbas'.

Madvig *adu. II* p. 104 started the opinion, afterwards taken up by Bergk and by some editors of Ovid and historians of literature, that the hexameter as well as the pentameter refers to Grattius, and alludes to his Bucolics. The Bucolics of Grattius belong to the same category as his Georgics and his Aeneid. To blot out the name of a bucolic poet which is extant in Ovid's MSS, and to bestow his Bucolics on a poet who is not recorded to have written any, is robbery and murder in one.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

## NOTES ON LUCAN IX.

84-88—Cornelia reveals to Sextus the message left by Pompey for his sons :

tu pete bellorum casus et signa per orbem,  
Sexte, paterna moue; namque haec mandata reliquit  
Pompeius uobis in nostra condita cura :  
' Me cum fatalis leto damnauerit hora,  
excipite, o nati, bellum ciuile. . . .'

HOSIUS and others have suspected v. 87, on the ground that it is omitted by most of the good MSS. But the omission, as Weber saw, is due to the similar endings of vv. 86-87 (*cura-hora*). It is difficult to see how a student of Lucan could convince himself that any other person is the author of v. 87, which not only improves the passage, but is wholly in keeping with the gloomy fatalism of Pompey as represented by Lucan in many other places. Francken's objection that the emphatic *me* should have a pronoun contrasted with it may be sufficiently answered by a reference to vv. 396-398 of the same book ; many instances from other authors could be added.

Several editors suspect v. 86. Their reasons are not very convincing. Some object to *in nostra condita cura*. Francken says that he could understand *nostro corde*, but *nostra cura* is meaningless to him. If he had removed his brackets and boldly read *nostro corde* it would have been easy to defend his action. The combination *mandata . . . condita* suggests that the author had in mind Cat. LXIV. 231 sq. *facito ut memori tibi condita corde | haec uigeant mandata*; *cura* might be due to the ocular error of a scribe, caused by *hora* at the end of the next line. (In that case, of course, the omission of v. 87 took place after the corruption of v. 86.) But it is not certain that this tempting idea ought to be accepted, for *in nostra condita cura* may surely mean 'stored in my keeping.' Lucan may even have thought of the message as having been put down in writing by Pompey and read or repeated from memory by Cornelia: with this idea v. 87 is particularly effective. In any case she speaks of the instructions as of Pompey's last will, left in her charge to be communicated to his heirs. This interpretation suits *mandata reliquit . . . uobis*, and incidentally it may comfort those who consider it awkward to have *uobis* dependent on

*mandata*: they are at liberty to take the pronoun with *reliquit*; 'Pompey left to you and your brother (*uobis*)<sup>1</sup> these instructions.'<sup>2</sup>

253-258—Now that Pompey is dead, Cato's soldiers wish to give themselves up to Caesar:

Actum Romanis fuerat de rebus, et omnis  
indiga seruitii feruebat litora plebes :  
erupere ducis sacro de pectore uoces :  
'ergo pari uoto gessistis bella iuuentus,  
tu quoque pro dominis, et Pompeiana fuisti,  
non Romana manus? . . .'

We have seen in the case of v. 87 how similarity of ending in two successive lines has caused one of the lines to be omitted in some MSS. Instances of like oscitancy on the part of scribes are only too frequent in Book IX. At vv. 201 sq. we find an interesting case. The scribe of Z had before him these words:

casta domus luxuque carens corruptaque numquam  
fortuna domini clarum et uenerabile nomen.

After he had written *corruptaque* his eye slipped from *numquam* to *nomen*, with the result that he ended v. 201 with that word, omitting *numquam* . . . *uenerabile*. This error has produced nonsense, and no editor, of course, has bracketed the words used by Z, but unfortunately there are places where lines omitted by the scribes may be omitted by the editors without damaging the construction. The opportunities so presented have been thankfully received, and Lucan has thus been robbed of some of his most characteristic verses. When one comes to the passage which heads this note, one may be pardoned for losing patience with the editors. Z originally omitted v. 256 because its beginning, *ergo pari*, looked like the beginning of v. 255, *erupere*. No one, however, would dream of obelizing the line, for the passage is hardly intelligible without it. The same cannot be said of vv. 253, 254, which are omitted by most (not all) of the chief MSS., but it is very difficult to see how the latest editors could have had the heart to bracket them. One might almost stake one's life on their genuineness. The cause of their omission is fairly obvious. A sleepy scribe mistook v. 254, which begins with *indiga*, for v. 252, which he had just copied, and which begins with *insiluit*; he thus skipped vv. 253, 254 and copied 255 immediately after 252.

The point which Cato's speech emphasizes is that while Pompey was alive they were fighting on behalf of a master, albeit a better master than Caesar would be: Pompey is now dead, and the issue is clear: it is now Liberty *versus* Caesar. The Pompeian soldiers, however, when they talk of joining

<sup>1</sup> For this use of *nos* addressed to a single person see Postgate in *Hermathena*, XVIII. (1914), p. 94. Cf. *uestra*, Sen. *ad Helviam*, I. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In v. 98 *mandata peregi* is used like *peregi iussa*, II. 338 sq. *Mandata* there refers to

Pompey's instructions to Cornelia to convey his message (the *mandata* of v. 85) to his sons. The repetition of the word in a different sense is awkward, but quite Latin.

Caesar  
endure

Indiga  
could l  
to adm  
bracke  
given  
omissa  
type o  
expecte  
interve  
second  
conjunc  
is given  
Pompe  
the wo  
Scaeva

In the  
device  
*erupere*  
express

28

The  
is in f  
increpat  
When v

Caesar, show that they must needs fight for a master (256 sq.)—they cannot endure freedom. Cf. 261 sq.:

quaerisque iugum ceruice uacanti,  
et nescis sine rege pati.

*Indiga seruitii* supplies such a trenchant commentary on the situation as could hardly have been invented by an interpolator. Francken feels compelled to admit that the expression is very like Lucan; indeed his suspicions of the bracketed lines seem to be rather half-hearted. His chief argument may be given in his own words: ‘Condicionalis fuerat postulat paene pro apodosi omissa aliud quam erupere (=ni erupisset).’ It is true that an expression of the type of *pons sublicius iter paene hostibus dedit, ni unus uir fuisset* might have been expected, but when Lucan wishes to say, ‘it was all over—had not one man intervened,’ his way is different. Instead of a clause with *ni* or *nisi* he uses a second principal clause, beginning with a spondee and devoid of any adversative conjunction. Thus the impression of a sudden check in the progress of events is given in the strongest and most vivid manner. In Book VI. we are told of Pompey’s assault on Caesar’s wall. Success seemed to be accomplished, and the world was at Pompey’s feet — no, not quite: one man, the centurion Scaeva, barred the way. See vv. 138 sqq.:

iam Pompeianae celsi super ardua ualli  
exierant aquilae, iam mundi iura patebant :  
quem non mille simul turmis nec Caesare toto  
auferret Fortuna locum, uictoribus unus  
eripuit.

In the passage of Book IX. which we are considering the effect of this device is even finer. The sense of sublime mastery conveyed in the words *erupere ducis sacro de pectore uoces*, coming immediately after the bustling line expressing the petty fuss of mean souls, is one of the best things in Lucan.

283-290 :

dixit, et omnes	
haud aliter medio reuocauit ab aequore puppes	
quam simul effetas linquunt examina ceras	285
atque oblita faui non miscent nexibus alas,	
sed sibi quaeque uolat nec iam degustat amarum	
desidiosa thymum: Phrygii sonus increpat aeris,	
attonitiae posuere fugam studiumque laboris	
floriferi repetunt et sparsi mellis amorem.	290

There are two questions of reading in v. 288. The authority of the MSS. is in favour of *increpat*, as against *increpet*, and there is no reason for rejecting *increpat*, which is specially effective in combination with the Perf. *posuere*. When we talk of the Perfect of Momentary Action, we must not forget that it

is a real Perfect. The meaning of *Phrygii . . . fugam* is properly, 'there comes the sound of Phrygian bronze, and in a trice they have stopped their flight.'

The reading *Phrygii* (cf. Verg. *G.* IV. 64, *Matris quate cymbala circum*) is supported by all good MSS., but *tum si* or *tunc si* is found as a correction in some, and Heinsius with fatal ingenuity conjectured *tunsi*, which is actually read by Francken. But it is obvious that this 'emendation' is founded on nothing more or less than a grammarian's comment! In those blessed days before the word 'Parataxis' was thrust down the throat of the young student, some commentator tried to explain matters to the ignorant by writing *tum si* over *Phrygii*, indicating that Lucan meant 'then if the sound of Phrygian bronze rings forth . . .' Similarly the codex Gemblacensis has a superscribed *si*, without *tum*. No one could have foretold that such an innocent comment would have such disastrous consequences.

297-299—Cato attacks Cyrene:

proximus in muros et moenia Cyrenarum  
est labor; exclusus nulla se vindicat ira,  
poenaque de uictis sola est uicisse Catonem.

Various readings and interpretations have been adopted in the case of v. 299. Some would read *deuictis*. The question is not easy to decide, but the balance of probability seems to be in favour of *de uictis*, because the antithesis (*uictis—uicisse*) is then slightly improved, and especially because the intensive *deuictis* is not so suitable to the context, which emphasizes Cato's mercifulness.

A more important point, which affects the interpretation of the whole line, is the question whether we ought to read *Catoni* or *Catonem*. *Catoni* (which involves *de uictis*, unless we regard *deuictis* as Abl. Abs. with *eis*, i.e. *Cyrenis*, understood) is poorly supported by the MSS., but it is favoured by most editors. The meaning of the line is supposed to be 'but the only punishment that Cato inflicts on the conquered is his having conquered them.' We must, of course, lay emphasis on *Catoni*; Cato was different from other conquerors. One cannot deny that a line with such a meaning might have been written by Lucan. *Poena est Catoni*, however, does not seem a very natural way of saying 'punishment is inflicted by Cato,' and the MSS. are decidedly in favour of *Catonem*, which Hosius retains. It seems to me that the reading supported by the MSS. gives a far richer meaning, a meaning typical of our author's cast of thought: 'but the only penalty suffered by the conquered is their having been conquered by Cato.' Francken objects that being conquered by Cato would be a glory, not a punishment, to the conquered. This view would not have been taken by the vanquished people, nor by Lucan himself, except perhaps in one of his most eccentric moods! But editors and commentators overlook the ethical meaning which Lucan attaches to the word *poena*. He uses it in various ways; one of the most striking is found later on in this book (v. 508). When Cato's soldiers were perishing for lack of water one of them at last detected a tiny trickle in the desert. With great difficulty he collected

a few c  
general

These  
may no  
such a  
of two  
qui-cla  
less ha  
thirst i  
that ca  
saintly  
them, i  
inflict a  
present  
uicta Ca

442

Few e  
whether  
(genera  
the mea  
wanting  
lines im  
explaine  
Perfect  
poet cou  
if anyon  
before i  
Present  
nascor,  
emenda

The  
Illum, w

a few drops, which he offered to his leader. Cato rebuked him for thinking his general so base as to drink while others thirsted, adding :

quanto poena tu dignior ista es,  
qui populo sitiente bibas !

These lines have been grievously misunderstood, so a word of explanation may not be out of place. The meaning is : 'How much worthier *you* are of such a punishment—to drink while the host is athirst.' There is a combination of two constructions with *dignior*: (1) the Abl. *poena ista*, (2) the Consecutive *qui*-clause. The unexpected *poena* (not *praemio*, as the soldier would doubtless have expected) is typical of Lucan's Cato. He who drinks while others thirst incurs the stigma of a weak character, and this is the worst punishment that can befall a man. The use of *poena* is similar in v. 299. The fact that the saintly Cato is their conqueror, the disgrace of having forced Cato to conquer them, is punishment enough for the people of Cyrenae, and Cato does not inflict any further punishment upon them. The sense of 'the unique Cato' is present in the line, with its emphatic ending, as in *victrix causa deis placuit, sed uicta Catoni*, and elsewhere (e.g. IX. 555).

447-454—An African sandstorm :

nam litore sicco  
quam pelago Syrtis uiolentius excipit austrum,  
et terrae magis ille nocet. non montibus ortum  
aduersis frangit Libye scopulisque repulsum  
dissipat et liquidas e turbine soluit in auras,  
nec ruit in siluas annosaque robora torquens  
lassatur ; patet omne solum liberque meatu  
Aeoliam rabiem totis exercet habenis.

Few editors approve of *ortum*, which cannot be satisfactorily explained, whether taken as noun or as verb. Except when he uses the noun *ortus* (generally in the plural) to signify 'the East,' Lucan is always careful to define the meaning by attaching an epithet. In the present case such an epithet is wanting, and it is unnatural to supply *austri*; when we consider, further, the lines immediately following, it will be clear that *ortum* cannot reasonably be explained as the Accusative of the noun. On the other hand, if we take it as Perfect Participle we foist on Lucan a senseless piece of padding such as no poet could be guilty of even at his worst. 'The wind after it had arisen'—as if anyone could suppose that the things mentioned could happen to the wind before it had arisen! Some would explain the word as equivalent to the Present Participle, but that is hardly possible in the case of a verb like *orior* or *nascor*, and it would be idiotic here. We have, then, a clear case for emendation.

There is no need to retail all the conjectures which have been made. *Illum*, which is found in one respectable codex, and is adopted by Francken, is

obviously a mere guess, and is awkward, rather than effective, after *ille* in the same line. Oudendorp's *ictum* (noun)—*Libyes* simply creates fresh difficulty, and, like *illum*, can hardly be defended on palaeographical grounds. I am very much inclined to think that Lucan wrote *artans*: 'Libya does not hem it in and break its force with confronting mountains.' The sense thus obtained is excellent, and *artans*, besides giving us a construction which Lucan uses elsewhere in passages like the present (cf. 451 *infra*), furnishes a good contrast to *pater omne solum*, etc., v. 453. Lucan uses *artare* in at least six other places. The fact that the termination *-um* occurs at the end of both the preceding and the following line might easily have caused the termination of *artans* to be assimilated. The remainder of the corruption hardly requires illustration, but one may mention as examples from the MSS. of Lucan *ora* for *ara* in I. 549, VII. 165 (*ore* I. 446), and the frequent confusion of *Mars* and *mors* (*Mors*).

590-593—Cato in the desert:

somni parcissimus ipse est,  
ultimus haustor aquae. cum tandem fonte reperto  
indiga cogatur laticis certare iuuentus,  
stat, dum lixa bibat.

I have given above the reading of the Teubner text. For *cogatur* Z has *conatur*; many MSS. read *latices*; lastly, for *certare* (P) we find *potare* (VZC et in ras. M U) or *portare* (G). It is clear that if we read *cogatur* we cannot read *potare*. At first sight *certare* is attractive, as *potare* looks like an emendation, and *certare* may, for all we know, be the word which has been erased in M and U. On the other hand, *cogatur*—*certare* is by no means satisfactory. The text as given above is supposed to mean 'when at length a spring is found and the soldiers, lacking water, are forced to fight with one another' (i.e. for a place beside the spring). But it is almost impossible to believe that Lucan, who obviously took special pains with this paragraph, could have expressed himself in such a vague and jejune manner, and, apart from that, the sense given is very near nonsense. If the soldiers were madly scrambling and fighting to reach the water, there was no merit in Cato's standing inactive: he could not have got a drink if he had tried, and he might have been torn to pieces; he was merely taking the safest course. But the point must surely be that although he had the chance of being the first to drink he refrained from quenching his thirst until the others were satisfied. We must therefore seek another solution.

The MSS. are very decidedly in favour of *potare*, and the erasure in M and U may represent an original *portare*, a slip of the pen which is found also in G. I would suggest that Lucan wrote:

indiga cunctatur<sup>1</sup> laticis potare iuuentus . . .

<sup>1</sup> *Cunctetur* is also possible.

' When  
water, h  
I ve  
meaning  
picture i  
sorely i  
that t  
related  
throats  
the few  
water.  
the pres  
tively a  
the tran  
Latin p

If t  
certare i  
conatur (

THE

'When at last a spring was found and the soldiers, though in sore need of water, hesitated to drink, he stood by till even the sutlers quenched their thirst.'

I venture to think that this reading gives a far fuller and more characteristic meaning than any of the others. *Indiga laticis* is no longer tame, and the picture is such as one would expect Lucan to draw. The devoted soldiers are sorely in need of refreshment; temptation to selfishness is strong, but they feel that their leader must take pride of place. The lines recall the incident related shortly before (vv. 498-510). We are told there that the soldiers' throats were parched (500, 504), and it was hard not to grudge their leader the few drops that had been collected (504 sq.), but a soldier offered Cato the water. On that occasion Cato refused to drink while his men thirsted, and in the present case he waits till even his *lixæ* have drunk. *Lixa* is used collectively and opposed to *iumentus* (the fighting men). The addition of 'even' in the translation given above is, of course, warranted by many other passages in Latin poetry; examples in Lucan may be found at V. 494, VI. 185, VIII. 795.

If the suggestion just proposed be adopted, we must explain the reading *certare* in P as an emendation made to suit the corrupt reading *cogatur*, and *conatur* (Z) must be derived from a reading *contatur=cunctatur*.

W. B. ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY,  
MANCHESTER.

## IS DONATVS'S COMMENTARY ON VIRGIL LOST?

AELIUS DONATVS, the noted grammarian of the fourth century of our era, wrote commentaries on Terence and Virgil. The commentary on Terence has been preserved, though in a curiously heterogeneous form which thus far has defied analysis. The most plausible supposition is that our present text is a conflation of two commentaries, one by Donatus himself, and one by Euanthius, whose work was obviously utilized for part of the introductory note on comedy. But even if this is the right statement of the question, the question remains to be solved. The problem of the commentary on Virgil is, unfortunately, more simple, or at least is universally adjudged more simple. We have extant Donatus's life of Virgil, his dedicatory letter to Lucius Munatius, and his introductory remarks on Bucolic poetry. The commentary itself, save for scattered references in later grammarians, glossaries, and commentaries, has been lost.

Let us turn for the moment from Donatus to the chief source of our information about his commentary on Virgil—namely, Servius. Here another sphinx confronts us. In 1600 Pierre Daniel included in his edition of Virgil what he calls *Seruui commentarii longe meliores et auctiores*. In certain manuscripts of the Servian commentary he had found numerous supplementary notes too valuable to be rejected as interpolations. He inferred, therefore, that the real and larger Servius was contained in these manuscripts, and that the text hitherto printed was merely an extract from the original commentary. This theory held the field for over two centuries and a half. Ribbeck, in the *Prolegomena* to his edition of Virgil,<sup>1</sup> did not dissent from it. But Thilo, in the Thilo-Hagen edition of Servius (1881), held that the real Servius is the briefer text (I will refer to it as S), while the *Scholia Danielis* (=D) are later editions, taken to be sure from the same valuable sources which Servius used. The combination, which we will call DS, was made, thinks Thilo, by some English or Irish scholar of the eighth century. Rival theories appeared, but Thilo's views were favoured by scholarly consensus, if that is determined by the approbation of Teuffel<sup>2</sup> and Schanz.<sup>3</sup> Of late, a new suggestion, or rather a modification of

<sup>1</sup> Leipzig, 1866, pp. 104 sqq., 189 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Roman Literature* (translated by Warr), Vol. II. (1892), pp. 396 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, II. 1 (1899).

an old  
dissimil  
charact  
of S wi  
but of  
which u  
D prece  
that of  
century  
put tog  
Ba

For Th  
such se  
Hemin  
number  
authors  
unthin  
by the  
the two  
difficult

Th  
comm  
excerp  
purpos  
absurd  
dismen  
Were  
lation  
by Da  
extrac  
this fa  
point  
*Aeneid*  
*Georgic*

I  
1 Hal  
p. 30.  
X Wessne  
(1908),  
verfolg  
hinter  
hinter  
komme  
tigkeit  
bildete  
manche  
ansieht

an old one,<sup>1</sup> has been proposed. Barwick,<sup>2</sup> emphasizing Thilo's proofs of the dissimilarity between *D* and *S*, seeks further to show that *D* no less than *S* has characteristic traits and unity of style. Therefore, the combination is not that of *S* with notes extracted by a later compiler from the numerous sources of *S*, but of *S* with another complete and independent commentary *D*, the author of which used the same sources as *S*. Moreover, Barwick argues, the commentary *D* preceded Servius; it may be placed chronologically between his work and that of Donatus. Its date would thus be about the third quarter of the fourth century. *DS*, the later compiler, who may well have lived in the British Isles, put together the two commentaries *S* and *D*.

Barwick's amendment strengthens Thilo's theory at a vulnerable point. For Thilo must assume that an insular scholar of the eighth century controlled such sources as Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Pacuvius, Lucilius, Cassius Hemina, and various works of Greek literature, or that he used a goodly number of commentaries and treatises of the Early Empire which cited the authors in question. The latter supposition is most dubious, the former is unthinkable. If, however, the valuable array of information and citation added by the compiler was already amassed in a single commentary *D*, the union of the two elements *S* and *D* on a tolerably careful and consistent plan is not too difficult an achievement for the early Middle Ages.

There can be no doubt that *D*, as Barwick says, is the earlier of the two commentaries. It can be shown in instance after instance that *S* has merely excerpted, with minor changes in phrasing, enough of a note of *D* to serve his purpose. This point has been hidden from the modern reader owing to Thilo's absurd method of constructing the text, in which *DS* is often dislocated and dismembered to suit the editor's view of what the original text contained. Were the *Scholia Danielis* printed just as the manuscripts give them, the relation of *S* to *D* would be obvious at a glance. They are so printed, in general, by Daniel and later editors, who thought, naturally enough, that *S* was an extract. So it is, but not from a larger work by the same author. Proof of this fact, once more, we owe to Thilo's careful analysis.<sup>3</sup> To mention just one point of divergence, Servius, as his cross-references show, comments first on the *Aeneid* and then on the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*; in *D* the order is *Bucolics*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid*.

If *D*, then, precedes Servius and is the main source of Servius, who can

<sup>1</sup> Halffpap-Klotz, *Quaestiones Servianae*, 1882, p. 30. The same suspicion also occurred to Wessner. See Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CXXXIX. (1908), p. 164: 'Wer alle diese Untersuchungen verfolgt, der gewinnt den Eindruck als wenn hinter mancherlei Werken, namentlich auch hinter gewissen Scholienmassen, ein Vergilkommentar stände, der infolge seiner Reichhaltigkeit eine gern und vielbenutzte Fundgrube bildete; ferner liegt der Gedanke nahe, dass in manchen Fällen, wo man jetzt Servius als Quelle ansieht, vielleicht eher jener Kommentar in

Frage gezogen werden müsste, dem dann eben Servius sehr viel entnommen hatte. Ich will mich mit dieser Bemerkung genügen und nur hinzufügen, dass es wohl lohnend und für einen erheblichen Teil der Scholienliteratur von Bedeutung sein möchte, diesen Dingern genauer nachzufolgen.'

<sup>2</sup> K. Barwick, *Zur Serviusfrage*, in *Philologus*, LXX. (1911), p. 106.

<sup>3</sup> *Prolegomena* to the Thilo-Hagen edition of Servius, I., pp. v sqq.

its author be? One answer tempts us, as we think of possibilities in the fourth century. It is tempting to think that Aelius Donatus's commentary on Virgil is not lost, but has been read unwittingly by several generations of scholars in the larger Servius or Daniel.<sup>1</sup> Servius, all agree, borrowed extensively from Donatus.<sup>2</sup> He cited him not infrequently. True, he cites him only to refute him, but does not this practice flourish to-day? Get your facts from the big book and demolish the author's minor judgments when you can. The interpretations attributed by Servius to Donatus are in the main trivial, but doubtless, as Nettleship<sup>3</sup> amongst others has declared, do not fairly represent the entire work of the earlier commentator. Now, Barwick points out that *D* is related to Donatus; indeed, he uses coincidences between *D* and Donatus's commentary on Terence to date *D* between Donatus and Servius.<sup>4</sup> But these coincidences may also be explained by supposing Donatus the author both of the commentary on Terence and of *D*.

The similarity of *D* to the commentary on Terence, an attractive clue that needs a careful following, prompts us to look about for other points of contact between *D* and what is known of Donatus's commentary on Virgil. Some information is given in the letter in which Donatus dedicates his work to Lucius Munatius. I will translate this brief but important document:

'Aelius<sup>5</sup> Donatus to Lucius Munatius, greeting,—

'I have examined the writings of almost all the scholars before me who were well versed in the works of Virgil, but in my earnest desire for brevity, of which I knew you to be fond, I have selected from the many matters only a few, preferring to incur the reader's righteous indignation for knowingly passing over numerous of the ancients' remarks rather than annoy him by filling my page with superfluities. You can listen, then, in this miscellany, to the pure voice of pristine authority. For though I have taken the opportunity here and there to insert my own explanations, I have wished, in fairness to those whose views I have rejected, to add their own words too. What, then, is the result? By briefly presenting these extracts from many sources, combined with my own interpretations, I can give the reader more pleasure, I believe, than he will derive from longer treatises elsewhere. Further, in selecting the best things from my authorities, I at once secure the interest of the reader by what

<sup>1</sup> I had reached the conclusions presented in this paper in 1914, before the revision of Teuffel by Kroll and Skutsch (Vol. III., 1913) was accessible to me. I naturally sympathize with the statement (p. 307) that 'man ist versucht, an Donats Vergilkommentar zu denken,' and that 'eine umfassende Prüfung dieser Frage wäre sehr erwünscht.' Wessner, apparently, is responsible for the article on Servius, and should be credited with the first statement of the proposition that I am here defending. He had not mentioned it in his review of Barwick's disserta-

tion (*De Junio Filargirio Vergilii interprete, in Commentationes philologae Ienenses*, VIII., 1909, pp. 57 sqq.); see *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1910, coll. 848 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> See Teuffel, *op. cit.* (1913), p. 305.

<sup>3</sup> *The Works of Virgil*, edited by Conington and Nettleship, revised by Haverfield, I. (1898), p. xcii.

<sup>4</sup> *Philologus*, loc. cit., p. 122.

<sup>5</sup> FL in the one manuscript (Paris, 11308, s. IX.) in which this letter is found. For the text see Brumner, *Vitae Vergilianae*, 1912, p. vii.

I select  
examini  
the spin  
a hand  
your be

Fr  
Virgil v  
necessa  
protest  
remind  
and da  
his arg  
from a  
diffuse,  
Nor is  
charact  
menta  
compil  
letter,  
the lif  
*Bucoli*  
seen, v

T  
in cert  
differen

F  
If our  
should  
citatio  
supple  
does  
this fa  
no ca  
attribu  
theory  
Imag  
Findi  
which  
that  
a criti

<sup>1</sup> M  
autem  
toribus

I select and save him from the tedium of what I have rejected. Do you, then, examine whether your prescriptions have been adequately fulfilled. For if, in the spirit of one of your remarks, the present work shows the way and lends a hand to the inexperienced teacher at the outset of his career, I have satisfied your behests; if not, do you ask of yourself what you miss in me. Farewell.'

From this introduction we may infer that Donatus's commentary on Virgil was a *Variorum* affair, with occasional judgments of his own. Was it necessarily brief? Perhaps we should so infer; yet possibly the author's protestation forestalls criticism of the undue length of his performance. I am reminded of Gislebertus Porretanus, who in the preface to his highly novel and dangerous commentary on Boethius's *Opuscula Sacra* expresses the fear that his arguments are so conventional that the reader will think them plagiarized from antiquity.<sup>1</sup> The commentary *D* compared with Servius is of course diffuse, but not more so, I believe, than Donatus's commentary on Terence. Nor is the letter to Munatius itself a model of conciseness. The other characteristics indicated by the writer fit *D* nicely; it is a *Variorum* commentary with valuable citation of ancient writers and expression of the compiler's own views. Another common feature may be deduced, not from the letter, but from the introduction on Bucolic poetry immediately following the life of Virgil. Donatus commented on the works of Virgil in the order *Bucolics*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid*, differing from Servius, but agreeing, as we have seen, with *D*.

The argument thus far proves merely a similarity between Donatus and *D* in certain important regards. So far as my investigation has gone, no essential differences have come to light. We now may examine the external evidence.

First, as we have noticed, there are direct citations of Donatus in Servius. If our theory is correct, the interpretations ascribed by Servius to Donatus should be found in *D*. That is nowhere, I believe, the case. Sometimes the citation of Donatus occurs in a note entirely by *S*. Sometimes the note is supplemented with remarks by *D* immediately preceding or following. Nowhere does *D* itself contain the comment called Donatus's by *S*. At first thought this fact seems adverse to our hypothesis. On the other hand, I have detected no cases in which *D* expressly subscribes to a view contrary to that which *S* attributes to Donatus. Indeed, a moment's consideration will show that our theory is not routed yet. We must not forget the operations of the compiler *DS*. Imagine just how he proceeded. He had before him Servius and Donatus. Finding a note in Donatus criticized by Servius, he selected for his compilation, which on the whole was intelligently made, not the note of Donatus but that of Servius, since the latter contained both the original comment and a criticism of it. Naturally we should not expect this comment to reappear in

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXIV., 1247: 'Quae scripturis authenticis adeo consona esse uidentur, autem a nobis scripta sunt, bene exercitatis lectoribus non modo rationibus firma, verum etiam

the part of *D* that survives in the compilation. There is hence no evidence in the citations of Servius against the supposition that *D* represents not all, but nearly all, of the commentary of Donatus.

We may note further the striking phenomenon that in the very criticisms of Servius the supplementary phrases of *D* occasionally appear. For example, in *Aeneid* VII. 1, Virgil says that Aeneas's nurse Caieta was buried 'on our shores' (*litoribus nostris*). *S*, appropriately quoting *Georgics* II. 89 (*non eadem arboribus pendet uindemia nostris*), takes *nostris* to mean *Italicis, non, ut Donatus ait, nauigabilibus*—what certainly is a foolish remark. Now just before *nauigabilibus* the manuscripts of *DS* have *in comparationem oceani*. We have refuted the view that *D* is a later set of additions from miscellaneous sources. We have agreed that the compiler is uniting Servius and a previous commentary *D*. We now must decide on the evidence of the present case, and others like it, whether this commentary is more naturally that of Donatus or that of some scholar writing after Donatus. The compiler *DS*, for the reasons just given, selects Servius's criticism rather than the comment in *D*. But he has also observed in *D* an additional phrase which, though not absolutely necessary, makes the meaning clearer. He therefore includes it. Would he have included it in what Servius expressly declares is Donatus's comment, had he not known that *D* was Donatus? Or would he have inserted in such a context a phrase of his own devising? It is far more natural to suppose that having both Servius and Donatus, he collated the two with some care, supplementing the former's criticisms of the latter from what he knew were Donatus's own words. Nor is this too scholarly a method to attribute to an editor of the early Middle Ages; the Berne Scholia descend from a distinctly elaborate compilation made by Adamnanus in the seventh century.

Of course, one may say, if the commentator proceeded thus intelligently, he might have inferred from Servius's direct statement and a comparison of the two notes that the other commentary at his disposal was that of Donatus; his manuscript of *D*, in this case, did not bear the name of Donatus in its title. We therefore need evidence apart from Servius of the existence of Donatus's commentary in the early Middle Ages. One bit of such evidence has long been accessible in Thilo.<sup>1</sup> In *Aeneid* I. 179, Virgil tells of the fire built by the shipwrecked Trojans, who then make ready to parch their grain and break it up with stones:

et torrere parant flammis et frangere saxo.

Servius remarks<sup>2</sup> that many find in this verse an instance of *hysteron proteron*, as they fail to see that the grain had been damaged by water, and hence had to be toasted first; he adds that grain is not infrequently warmed before grinding anyway. *D* supplements *S* with the comment that certain critics, to avoid a resort to *hysteron proteron*<sup>3</sup> understand that some men did the toasting and

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, I., p. xv.

<sup>2</sup> Multi hysteron proteron putant, non respici-  
entes superiora, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Quidam ne hysteron proteron sit alios tor-  
rere, alios frangere, accipiunt.

some the grinding. Now in one of the manuscripts of *DS*, the famous *Turonensis* of Virgil,<sup>1</sup> appears the scholium :

Donatus dicit histeroproteron esse id est ordinem permutatum—sed Seruius dicit non esse.

The scholiast of the *Turonensis*, therefore, had access to both Donatus and Servius. He read the notes in both and contrasted them, just as Servius contrasts his own view with that of 'many' unnamed commentators. He must have included Donatus among these, though not mentioning him directly. As in the cases where he does mention him, the latter's view does not appear in the part of *D* which *DS* has combined with Servius. But in this case we may infer that a note approving *hysteron proteron* had preceded the present fragment of *D*. The remark that some commentators resorted to a certain explanation in order not to recognize *hysteron proteron* suggests that *hysteron proteron* had just been recommended. I may add that in other instances the commentator *D* shows a weakness for this rhetorical figure.<sup>2</sup> Tiberius Claudius Donatus, on the other hand, rejects it here.<sup>3</sup> I agree, then, with Thilo in regarding the note in the *Turonensis* as evidence of the existence of Donatus's commentary in the ninth century, and believe further that it tends to support our identification of Donatus with *D*.

There remain two pieces of external testimony in favour of our theory. One is furnished by *Codex Bernensis* 172, s. IX.-X. (formerly at Fleury). In this manuscript the works of Virgil are preceded by the so-called *Carmen Octauiani Caesaris* and other such matter, and are accompanied by the Berne Scholia for the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics* *DS* for *Aeneid* III.-XII., and nothing at all for *Aeneid* I.-II. This peculiar condition, taken with similar evidence in the other manuscripts, suggests that the compilation *DS* was originally divided into five volumes, and that only volumes 3, 4, and 5 were accessible to the writer of that codex from which the *Floriacensis*, the *Turonensis*, and other manuscripts descend. Now the notes in the *Floriacensis* are headed by Donatus's *Vita Vergilii* and the *Vita* of the Berne Scholia. The latter *Vita*, of course, is integrally connected with the Berne Scholia found subsequently in the manuscript. It presumably follows that Donatus's *Vita* belongs with the remaining commentary in the manuscript—namely, that of *DS*. If Donatus wrote the life, he wrote the scholia too. Of course, an important work like the *Vita* might be copied separately with texts of Virgil, as is admittedly the case in some of our manuscripts. We need, however, a careful examination of all

<sup>1</sup> *Bernensis* 165, s. IX. On the basis of a considerable study of the books of Tours, I should date this manuscript nearer the beginning than the middle of the ninth century. It exhibits what I would call the Alcuinian variety of the script developed at St. Martin's. It is not at all impossible that Alcuin superintended a special edition of the works of Virgil.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. on *Aeneid* VIII. 593, 611; XI. 243.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. H. Georgii (1905), I. 41: 'hic errant male interpretantes et disputando pessime suum confitentur errorem dicendo praeposterum ordinatione posuisse Vergilium cum prius sit frangere saxo hoc est molere postea uero torrere flammis quasi panem coquere.'

the manuscripts containing the *Vita*, to see if notes of *D* or *DS* may not be found among whatever scholia they possess.

The most important witness to our theory that I can invoke is the *Liber Glossarum*. This lexicon, which according to the current view<sup>1</sup> was compiled about 750 in Spain, derives a goodly number of its definitions either from *DS* or, more probably, from *D* itself. I have noticed three cases in which material is ascribed to Donatus that we find, with significant correspondences of phrasing, in *D* or *DS*. For example, *D* has on *Eclogues VIII. 27*, a note on *grypes*, of which Servius excerpted the following:

genus ferarum in hyperboreis nascitur montibus. Omni parte leones sunt,  
alis et facie aquilis similes, equis uehementer infestae, Apollini  
consecratae.

This information is utilized, with changes in the wording, by both Philargyrius<sup>2</sup> and the Berne Scholia.<sup>3</sup> They describe the gryphon, for instance, as *equis inimicissimus* or *semper equos adfectans*, thus giving the meaning of *equis uehementer infestae* in *DS*. But the *Liber Glossarum* says:

Grypes quadrupedes uolucres. Donatus ait grypides infestum equis apud  
Hyperboreos oriundum.

The author of the lexicon, then, cites here and elsewhere<sup>4</sup> as Donatus what we find in *D*. The burden of proof rests on those who think that *D* is not Donatus but an intermediate link between Donatus and Servius. Seeing no compelling argument for the assumption of such an intermediary, I conclude that we have in *D* the very work of Donatus.

My theory, I admit, is in the stage of suggestion and plausibility rather than of certainty. Before we can speak of proof, or, if absolute proof is impossible, before we can grant the theory precedence of its rivals in the field of plausible conjecture, we must subject Servius to a thorough scrutiny, showing that all the evidence there contained comports with the theory and that none contradicts it. We must examine with the same purpose, among other material, Donatus's Terentian commentary, Macrobius, the *Mythographi Vaticani*, Isidore of Seville, and the various grammarians and commentators who refer to either Donatus or Servius. The *Liber Glossarum*, not all of which is published, may well contain further clues. Part of this wide territory will be covered before long in a dissertation by a member of the Harvard Graduate School. Pending that and similar studies, we should at least not be too certain that Donatus's commentary on Virgil is lost. E. K. RAND.

<sup>1</sup> See Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1911, pp. 133 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Servius, edition Thilo-Hagen, III., 2, p. 149.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, appar. criticus to l. 17.

<sup>4</sup> I am indebted to Wessner in his review of Barwick (see above, p. 3, note 1) for the instance

here given. Wessner also cites *Georgics I. 164*. He is concerned here with supplementing Barwick's proof that Philargyrius used Donatus. The same material, which can be considerably increased, is still more valuable as evidence that *D* is identical with Donatus.

## LATIN VERB FORMS.

### A. CONTRACTED *V*—PERFECTS.

#### CLASS 1. *Audisti, audissem, audisse.*

These forms would result regularly from the longer forms, *audivisti*, etc. The *v* drops out between two like vowels, and these then contract immediately (cf. *divitis* > *ditis*). Both the long and the short forms are used, but the intervening forms *audiisti*, etc., do not occur in early Latin, just as *diitis* is not found. (This is the ordinary explanation,<sup>1</sup> and quite sufficient, but see under Class 5.)

Class 2. *Amasti, amassem, amasse; complesti, complessem, complexe; nosti, nossem, nosse.*

In these forms we find the anomalous changes *avi* > *a*, *evi* > *e*, *ovi* > *o* (cf. *clāvis, lēvis, prōvidus, prūdens, <prōvidens*). They are not the result of regular contractions, but are due to the analogy of the regularly shortened forms of Class 1, according to the proportions:

*audi-visti : audi-sti = ama-visti : ama-sti; comple-visti : comple-sti ; no-visti : no-sti.*<sup>2</sup>

#### Class 3. *Complerunt, compleram, complerim, complero.*

These forms, like those of Class 1, may have resulted regularly from the unshortened forms which have *e* before and after the *v*. (But see under Class 5.)

#### Class 4. *Amarunt, amaram, amaro, amarim; norunt, noram, noro, norim.*

These forms may be made on the analogy of the corresponding forms of *e* verbs, *complerunt*, etc., according to the proportion:

*comple-veram : comple-ram = ama-veram : ama-ram ; no-veram : no-ram.*

But the verbs in *-evi* are neither a very large class, nor is there any one verb in it of such frequent occurrence as to have dominated the large class of verbs in *-avi*.<sup>3</sup> Besides, the same analogical process must inevitably have produced the change: *audivērunt* > *audirunt*, etc., of which not a trace exists.<sup>4</sup> (See under Class 5.)

<sup>1</sup> Stolz, *lateinische Grammatik*, pp. 52, 280. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, pp. 176, 609 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Stolz and Sommer, *l.c.* For another theory, cf. Solmsen, *Studien zur lateinischen Lautgeschichte*, pp. 177 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Stolz, *l.c.*; Sommer, *l.c.*; and Stolz, *Kuhn's*

*Zeitschr.* 38, p. 428.

<sup>4</sup> *Sino* is the only verb that has such forms. This is a striking case of the exception proving the rule. For the occurrence of forms like *sirim* serves to emphasize the entire absence of forms like *audirim*. *Sirim* is probably an *s* aorist with rhotacism.

Class 5. *Audērunt, audēram, audēro, audērim.*

These forms cannot be derived phonetically from *audiverunt*, etc., nor can they come by analogy from *complerunt*, etc. For analogy could produce only the forms *audirunt, audiram*, etc., which are non-existent.

Attempts have been made accordingly to find a foundation for the forms in question in the similar forms of the verb *eo*, such as *ieram, iisti*, etc.<sup>1</sup> Such attempts, however, invariably neglect the chronology and the frequency of the full (better, perhaps, 'lengthened') forms of *eo* (*iveram, etc.*), and of the shortened forms of *audio* with two *i*'s (*audiisti, etc.*). A closer investigation of these points discloses the fact that when the form *audieram* made its appearance there was no parallelism, probably, between the perfect forms of *eo* and *audio* striking enough, if there was any, to serve as a basis for analogical changes. So the proportion:

$$i\text{-veram} : i\text{-eram} = audi\text{-veram} : audi\text{-eram}$$

will not hold true, because the form *iveram* was extremely rare in early Latin, and in fact never became very common, and so was not likely to serve as a point of departure for analogy.<sup>2</sup>

Nor will the following proportion hold:

$$i\text{-it} : audi\text{-it} = i\text{-eram} : audi\text{-eram},$$

because *audiit, audiimus, audiissem, audiisse* did not appear until after Terence.<sup>3</sup>

The following analogical proportion is possible:

$$isti : audisti = ieram : audieram.$$

But the forms *abisti, abisse*, etc., although almost invariably given by the manuscripts of Plautus and Terence, are never required by the metre, while the forms with *-ii-* are often required and always possible.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore doubtful whether the form *isti* was of sufficiently frequent use in early Latin to influence other verbs by analogy. Besides, if the relation *isti : audisti* had the above effect, it could hardly have failed to produce simultaneously, or rather previously, as being nearer and more obvious, the relation *iisti : audiisti?*—a relation that was established later, when the formation of *audieram* next to *ieram* had formed a link between the two verbs.

We are driven then to seek an explanation elsewhere. The suggestion which I make below not only satisfactorily explains the forms in this class, but also those of Classes 1, 3, 4, as being due to the same process.

<sup>1</sup> So Sommer, *l.c.*; Solmsen, *l.c.*; and Kuehner, *Latinische Grammatik* 2 (index), p. 814.

<sup>2</sup> Engelbrecht, *Wiener Studien*, 1885, pp. 234 sqq.: In Terence 'ivi,' etc., does not occur at all; in Plautus only (and these rarely) the simplex and compounds with 'ex-' and 'amb-.' (That is, where the operation of the Iambic Law did not prevent the formation of a long second syllable, as it did in *abiisti*.)

<sup>3</sup> The first instance is *C.I.L.* I., 38—PETIEI—

in an elegiac couplet in honour of the Scipio who was praetor in a.u.c. 615. The absence of *audiit* in Plautus and Terence is especially significant, as it makes a convenient close for iambic and catalectic trochaic verses.

<sup>4</sup> Engelbrecht, *l.c.*, shows that the MSS. are very unreliable in this respect, often giving two *i*'s where a form is undoubtedly present tense and one *i* where the metre requires two.

In Latin there was a much used aorist of  $*\sqrt{bhū}$  in the form  $*fūm$ ,  $*fūs$ ,  $*fūt$ ; Greek  $\check{\epsilon}\phi\bar{v}n$ ,  $\check{\epsilon}\phi\bar{v}s$ ,  $\check{\epsilon}\phi\bar{v}t$ . This aorist root was given perfect endings (cf. *vidi, feci*). Thus we have  $*fū-ai > *fūi$  (*Ennius, Ann. 431 M, fūimus*). Then, before endings beginning with a vowel, a transitional *v* crept in, and there was the form in rapid speech  $*fūvi$  (cf. *C.I.L., I., 1051, FVVIT*). Then by wrong division and analogy we have the proportion :

$$\begin{aligned} *fū- : *fū-vi &= ama- : ama-vi \\ &= comple- : comple-vi \\ &= no- : no-vi \\ &= audi- : audi-vi. \end{aligned}$$

This is Sommer's explanation of the origin of *v* perfects.<sup>1</sup>

Now this *v* sound in *fūvi* must have been fluctuating, as the fact that it disappeared again later shows, so that there was a carefully uttered *\*fūeram* beside a more careless *\*fūveram*. The verb then continued its influence on the *v* perfects, which it had itself brought into being, by causing them to have this same fluctuating *v*, and we have the proportions :

$$\begin{aligned} *fū-veram : *fū-eram &= ama-veram : *ama-eram > amaram \\ &= comple-veram : *comple-eram > compleram \\ &= no-veram : *no-eram > noram \\ &= audi-veram : audi-eram > audieram \end{aligned}$$

and also :

$$*fū-visti : *fū-isti = audi-visti : *audi-isti > audisti. \text{ (See Class I.)}$$

I should say that the right-hand ratios do not have to stand or fall with the correctness of the assumed forms of *fui*. The ratio X : Y would do as well on the left side. What I mean is that some analogical force was applied in the manner shown to all the verbs simultaneously, forcing the *v* out and leaving the variously interacting vowels in juxtaposition.

The change from *\*amaeram* to *amaram*, etc., is regular in Latin (cf. *\*ama-j-es > amas*, *\*pro-emo > promo*, etc.)—*audieram* is not a starred form, but is found in Terence, *Phorm. 573*. The long *i* was regularly shortened before a following vowel.

#### Class 6. *audiisti*, etc.

As I have shown under Class 5, these forms are rare and later than Terence, and were probably made after *audieram*, according to the proportion :

$$i-eram : audi-eram = i-isti : audi-isti.$$

<sup>1</sup> *l.c.*, p. 606.

## B. SYNCOPATED PERFECTS.

Class 1. *dixti, dixe, duxti*, etc.

In these forms the present stem is easily recognizable. In my opinion they are made on the analogy of the contracted *v* perfects according to the proportion :

$$\text{ama-} : \text{ama-sti} = \text{dic-} : \text{dic-sti} > \text{dixti}.$$

Class 2. *misti, iusti*, etc.

These forms probably follow *dixti* :

$$\text{dix-i} : \text{dix-ti} = \text{mis-i} : \text{mis-ti}.$$

The syncopated forms are found only in *-si* perfects, and did not become permanently fixed in the language. The reason why they are not found in other perfects may be that there was a passing prejudice against the accumulation of *s* sounds in these forms,<sup>1</sup> and that the analogy of *amasti* offered the most natural remedy.

ERNEST RIEDEL.

TULANE UNIVERSITY,  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA.

<sup>1</sup> Sommer, *l.c.*, p. 617.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** XXXVI. 4. 1915.

Abby Leach, *Fatalism of the Greeks*. The current opinion that the Greeks were fatalists is a perversion of the truth, though fate and fortune do play a part in Greek literature and life. The attitude of various writers to the question is examined and illustrated by quotation. R. B. Steele, *Q. Curtius Rufus*. A study of parallelisms in Curtius to other Latin writers (Livy, Vergil, Horace, Velleius, Valerius Maximus, Lucan, Seneca, Pliny N.H., Tacitus, Pompeius Trogus and Justin, Orosius) with a view to determine his date. Curtius certainly wrote later than the age of Augustus and probably later than the reign of Claudius. The first years of Alexander Severus fit the indications best. A. C. Johnson, *Studies in the Financial Administration of Athens*. The history of the administration of finance is traced from 307 to 191 B.C., and its control by a minister (*ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ διοικήσει*) or a board (*οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ διοικήσει*) respectively is seen to be connected with constitutional changes, according as the government was oligarchical or despotic or on the other hand democratical. In *Indiculus Syntacticus* B. L. Gildersleeve gives an alphabetical index of his contributions to Syntax as published in the thirty-six volumes of the *A.J.P.*

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.** 1916.

Feb. 12. E. Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (P. Jahn). The reviewer suggests that Cic.'s words (*Brut.* 76) which, if *relinquo* there means 'pass over,' seem to be inconsistent with the fragments of Ann. VII., may possibly be interpreted 'would have allowed that first Punic war still to count as the fiercest war.' He calls attention to the order of the words '*primum illud Punicum acerrimum bellum reliquisset*' and compares such phrases as '*in medio relinquere*' and *Tusc.* 3, 42 '*quid haberent, quod in bonis relinquenter*'—*Der römische Limes in Oesterreich*. XII. (Anthes). Throws light not only on Carnuntum but on Roman camps in general.

Feb. 19. F. Noack, *Σκηνὴ τραγική*. Eine Studie über die szenischen Anlagen auf der Orchestra des Aischylos und der anderen Tragiker (Wecklein). F. Preisigke, *Fachwörter des öffentlichen Verwaltungsdienstes Ägyptens in den griechischen Papyrusurkunden der ptolemäisch-römischen Zeit* (Gelzer). Supplements the ordinary Lexicon.

Feb. 26. C. P. Gunning, *De sophistis Graeciae praeceptoribus* (Nestle). Criticizes the view expressed in H. Gomperz's 'Sophistik und Rhetorik.' G. Rauschen, *Florilegium Patristicum*, digestum vertit adnotavit G. R. Fassc. X.: *Tertulliani de paenitentia et de pudicitia recensio noua* (Bitschofsky). E. Krüger and D. Krencker, *Vorbericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabung des sog. römischen Kaiserpalastes in Trier* (Anthes). K. P. Schulze contributes to this and two following numbers some notes on Horace.

March 4. W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*. 3 ed. (Rehm). Long review pointing out many faults.

March 11. F. Vollmer, *Inscriptiones Baiuariae Romanae* ed. F. V. (Haug). Carefully edited, with valuable Indices. F. Lübkers, *Reallexicon des klassischen Altertums*. 8 ed. by J. Geffcken und E. Ziebarth (Pohlens). A useful book in one vol. of 1152 pp., intended to give the most necessary information, with references to fuller dis-

cussions of each subject. A new book rather than a new edition. W. H. Roscher, *Neue Omphalosstudien. Ein archäologischer Beitrag zur vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft* (Blümner). Not less interesting than R.'s earlier studies.

March 18. C. Robert, *Oidipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes in Altertum* (Bucherer).

### Classical Philology. II. I. 1916.

C. H. Moore, *Tύχη προλογίζοντα and the Identification of the Speaker of the Prologue*. Starting from a comic fragment in which *Tύχη* is introduced as speaker of the prologue, without being brought into any real connexion with the play, the writer traces the use of the prologue through Greek and Latin drama and its gradual detachment from the business of the play. E. T. Sage, *Petronius, Poggio and John of Salisbury*. Criticizes A. C. Clark's view that the 'particula Petronii' which Poggio sent to Niccoli from Britain in 1423 was the *Cena Trimalchionis*. The 'particula' cannot be identified with certainty. John of Salisbury knew all parts of Petronius; but it is not certain that he had a MS. The *Cena* may have been found at Cologne by Poggio in a MS. similar to A (the *Traguriensis*) in contents and form. B (Bern. Lit. 357) probably came from Fleury. A. E. R. Boak, *The Magistri of Campania and Delos*. These were *magistri fanorum* or supervisors of the shrines and cults of certain divinities and not presidents of religious collegia. E. K. Rand, *The New Critical Edition of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. A detailed criticism of Magnus' recent edition. B. L. Ullman notes that in choosing names for his characters Plautus is less 'Menandrian' than Terence. R. H. Tanner, *The Δραπέτες of Cratinus and the Eleusinian Tax Decree*. An accumulation of proofs that the decree was passed in the spring of 443 and the play performed in the following spring. Among Notes and Discussions Keith Preston suggests that in Petronius 69. 5 'harundinibus quassis' should be 'h. cassis (=cauis)', that in 57. 4 'numquid pater fetum emit lamna?' the allusion is to an *admissarius*, and that in 127. 5 'quemadmodum ego te uolo' *uelo* is a strengthened *amo*. A. R. Anderson would take the gen. *uiāi* in Ennius *Anu.* 203 as a 'Greek' ablative, and in Sextus Empiricus *πρὸς μονακούς* 21 P. Shorey reads *ἄλλ' ὦ* (for *ὦ*) *περισπαρτικήν*.

### The Classical Weekly (New York).

Feb. 12. *The Cambridge Medieval History*: Vol. I. (J. F. Ferguson). 'The volume maintains a high level of excellence. Some chapters stand out, however, as the work of great scholars—those by Reid, Gwatkin, Butler, Haverfield, Vinogradoff, and Peisker especially.'

Feb. 19. This number includes a full discussion by A. R. Wightman of Caes. *B. G.* IV. 28. 3 and of Dr. Rice Holmes's interpretation of the passage in his *Ancient Britain* and in his annotated edition of *B. G.* pp. 442-6.

March 4. J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (M. W. Humphreys). The reviewer gives a summary of the book but is unwilling 'for the present at least, to assume a positive attitude.'

March 18. Tenney Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (A. C. Johnson). 'Occasionally the writer turns a blind eye at Roman aggression, yet his keen analyses of the politics which led to the various steps in expansion are more often convincing than not.'

March 25. G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army* (W. L. Westermann). 'He has been able to place the development of the auxiliary service in the framework of the Empire so that the essay, though necessarily technical and confined in scope, has distinct touches of universal historical interest.' H. Güntert, *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen* (R. G. Kent). 'This influence . . . has already received full recognition in the matter of case and personal endings.'

In the history of suffixes it is not so well recognized; as a factor in the phonetics of roots it has had but a tithe of the respect which it deserves. G. has shown what possibilities lie in it.'

**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** 1915.

Nov. 27. H. Ringeltaube, *Quaestiones ad veterum philosophorum de affectibus doctrinam pertinentes* (Philipsson). Valuable.

Dec. 4. A. Jacobus, *Plato und der Sensualismus* (Gomperz). The 'new results' are based on misunderstandings.

Dec. 11. H. Gomperz, *Die Lebensauffassung der griechischen Philosophen und das Ideal der inneren Freiheit* (Busse). Will make a deep impression on all readers. C. Zander, *Eurythmia*. II. Numeri latini aetas integra. III. Eurythmia Ciceronis (Bögel). Receives some praise.

Dec. 18. F. Andres, *Die Engellehre der gr. Apologeten des IIten Jahrhunderts* (Heinisch). Ingenious and industrious. W. Meyer, *Die Preces der mozarabischen Liturgie* (Werner).

Jan. 1. M. Valeton, *De Iliadis fontibus et compositione* (Stürmer). The author has failed in his object.

Jan. 8. W. H. Roscher, *Neue Omphalosstudien* (Nilsson).

Jan. 15. P. Natorp, *Über Platons Ideenlehre* (Höffmann). The critic refers to his own researches. G. Arndt, *Emendationes Epicureae* (Nestle). The conjectures are not arbitrary and show deep thought. A. Kochelsky, *Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs*. Diogenes Laertius, Bk. X., translated by A.K., with critical remarks. The translation is careful, and the critical remarks of great value.

Jan. 22. E. Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (Marx). The results cannot be accepted.

Jan. 29. Peterson, *Goethe und Aristoteles* (Kalischer). A subject upon which no new results are possible. L. Dugas, *L'amitié antique* (Nestle). Unsatisfactory. E. Wolff, *Taciti Historiae*, with explanatory notes by E. W. (Wackermann). Highly praised. W. Klein, *Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus* (Rosenberg). Well thought out.

Feb. 5. C. Wessely, *Aus der Welt der Papyri* (Gerhard). The choice of the material is somewhat arbitrary: otherwise the work is well done. H. von Arnim, *Platons Jugenddialoge und die Entstehungszeit des Phaidros* (Ritter). The chronological conclusions are doubtful.

Feb. 12. A. Mansion, *Introduction à la physique Aristotélicienne* (Nestle). Well thought out and ably arranged. C. Harder, *Platons Symposium*, explained by Schmelzer, revised by C. H. (Nohle). To be welcomed.

Feb. 19. O. Apelt, *Platons Sophistes*, Politikos, Menon, translated and explained by O. A.; C. Ritter, *Platons Phaidros*, translated and explained by C. R. (Moog), On the level of the latest researches.

Feb. 26. H. Skassis, (i.) *Adnotationes criticae ad Ciceronis librum qui De Fato inscribitur*; (ii.) *Observationes criticae in quosdam locos primi libri qui est De Divinatione* (Sachs). The contents are in keeping with the excellence of the form.

Mar. 4. H. Bartlett van Hoesen, *Roman cursive writing* (Wessely). The reproductions of the alphabets are insufficient. H. M. Hubbel, *The influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides* (Nestle). Well done. H. Lamer, *Römische Kultur im Bilde*. Is recommended.

Mar. 11. J. L. Heiberg, *Archimedis opera omnia* it. ed. J. L. H. III. (Manitius). The critical apparatus is thoroughly revised. There are three good indices.

Mar. 18. A. Trendelenburg, *Pausanias in Olympia* (Heberdey). Follows the trend of modern criticism in giving less attention to his supposed sources, and more to his way of thinking and expressing himself. The critic differs however in fundamental matters.

Mar. 25. E. Meyer, *Der Emporkömmling* (Nestle). Fellows the type of the adventurer in private and public life in the various forms of Greek and Latin literature.

**Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.** 1915. XI. XII.

A. Schulten, *Numantia I. Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom* (Bauer). Very instructive, but exactness in detail is overdone. M. Niebuhr Tod, *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks* (Ziebarth). The critic regrets that mention is made only of arbitration between nations, and not of calling in arbitrators from abroad for home questions.

**Hermes.** LI. 1. 1916.

M. Wellmann, *Pamphilos*. The writer treats of the source of Aelian in natural history, and withdraws his former suggestion that this source was Alexander of Myndos. From renewed researches he reaches the conclusion that the source was not a writer on natural history, but some large selection of extracts by a grammarian, and this may well be Pamphilos, who presumably edited, in addition to his *Lexikon*, a work on natural history, entitled *Φυσικά*. This however will not have been an independent work, but a section of his *Λεξιόν*, which was a work preparatory to the *Lexikon*. H. Dessau, *Pontius, der Biograph Cyprians*. D. identifies the biographer with an official of Curubis mentioned in CIL. VIII. 980. W. Otto, *Die Nobilität der Kaiserzeit*. O. rejects the thesis of Gelzer (*Hermes* 50, p. 395 sq.), according to which the nobility in the imperial period was a strictly closed body, and so disappeared in the second century A.D. Even in the imperial period nobility could be won for descendants by the possession of certain official positions. H. F. Müller, *Plotinische Studien*. Ennead I. 1. is paraphrased and the text and matter discussed. O. Viedebantt, *Der athenische Volksbeschluss über Mass und Gewicht*. V. gives the text after fresh examination, with translation and commentary. The resolution is noteworthy, as it describes the reception of the Roman system of weights and measures, and so gives a picture of the dependence of Athens on Rome in the second century B.C. A. Körte, *Zum 2. Buch von Vergil's Aeneis*. A discussion of the Helen episode in Aen. II. 567-588, against R. Heinze. MISZELLEN. H. Toepfer maintains that the prologue to Terence's *Andria* was written for the original performance. E. Hohl maintains that Petrarch did not possess the codex Palatinus 899 of the *Historia Augusta*, but read it cursorily and had it copied later. F. Jacoby writes on Jesus in Josephus.

**LI. 2. 1916.**

†L. Cohn, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Philo*. Remarks and conjectures on *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, *De uita contemplativa* and *De aeternitate mundi*. A. Mentz, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Stenographie*. (i.) *Isidor und die römische Stenographie*. On the meaning and the sources of Isidorus, where he speaks of short-hand. (ii.) *Die christlichen Bestandtheile der Commentarii notarum Tironianarum*. The Christian *addita* were made in the fifth century in Gaul; they are not by Cyprian. (iii.) *Die erdkundlichen Namen in den Commentarii not. Tir.* III. 1. The geographical names are arranged according to a geographical principle and according to the form of the notes. (iv.) *Die Anlage von Senecas Verzeichniss tironischer Noten*. Seneca's edition of the *notae* consisted of four *commentarii*: (a) stem-signs, ending-signs, etc., (b) words taken from public life, (c) names of towns, (d) words taken from private life. E. Täubler, *Die nicht bestimmhbaren Hinweise bei Josephus und die Anonymus-hypothese*. Josephus refers 238 times to passages in his own works, but as a rule the passages are not to be found: the explanation is that the work was an abbreviated translation of his own Aramaic edition, and not that his source was anonymous. G. Thiele, *Die Poesie unter Domitian*. (i.) *Das Sulpicia-Gedicht*. The Sulpicia verses are

authentic; they were composed immediately after the banishment of the philosophers and published after her death. (ii.) *Interesse des Kaisers an der Poesie.* The authors of the fable that Domitian was an enemy to higher culture are the opposition consisting of senators and philosophers. (iii.) *Verhältniss Domitians zu Statius und Martial.* Domitian only moderately appreciated their works. K. Ziegler, *Zu Cicero De re publica.* (i.) *Zur Reconstruction des Palimpsestes.* (ii.) *Zur Textgeschichte im Altertum.* C. Robert, *Tyro.* On the evolution of the Tyro-myth. F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Das athenische Psephisma über Salamis.* Conjectures. MISZELLEN. F. Bechtel, Εὐρυπῶν or Εὐρύφῶν? (Herod. VIII. 131). C. Weyman on Tert. *Apol.* 48. 1. W. Jaeger on Enn. *Ann.* frg. 222 (Vahlen). B. Keil on Ar. *Knights*, 814. K. Praechter on Plato *Gorgias*, 521 E. G. Wissowa, Περικειρομένη bei Tacitus. On Tac. *Germ.* 19.

**Neue Jahrbücher.** XVIII. 1915.

XVIII. 5. Franz Studniczka, *Die griechische Kunst an Kriegergräbern.* Descriptive article, with illustrations.

XVIII. 6. Ernst Howald, *Die Weltanschauung Senecas.* Expository discussion of the contradictory Epicurean and Stoic tendencies in Seneca's philosophy,—Seneca was temperamentally an aristocrat, and we cannot reconcile his personal feelings with his formal theories. Arthur Stein, *Tacitus als Geschichtsquelle.* Tacitus was well fitted by position, education, and character for an historian; he was influenced by racial, religious, and social pride, and did not attempt to write a complete history of his period. More admired than read, as Lessing says.

XVIII. 7. Hans Philipp, *Die archäologische Erforschung Apuliens.* Discussion of pre-Greek, Messapian and Iapygian remains and extent of influence. Wilhelm Soltau, *Die Ursachen eines antiken Weltkrieges.* We should regard the wars between Rome and Carthage not as three separate wars, but as three different phases of one conflict. It was really the successor in a different place and time of the ancient Greco-Phoenician rivalry in the eastern Mediterranean. Rome, by a self-seeking, ruthless policy, became influential over the Italian and Sicilian Greek cities, and henceforth was their champion against the Carthaginians.

XVIII. 9. Otto Immisch, *Neue Wege der Platonforschung.* Distinguishes between an earlier and a later 'Phaedrus,' basing his deductions on a careful analysis of the myth, the winged soul and the winged, two-horse chariot not blending very well together.

XVIII. 10. Alfred Klotz, *Der Helvetierzug: zur Glaubwürdigkeit von Cäsars Commentarii de Bello Gallico.* Discusses political aspects of the Helvetian movement, which are not always given due weight by Caesar. On the whole, Caesar's narrative is, however, to be regarded as accurate.

XVIII. 10 II. Richard Meister, *Aristoteles als ethischer Beurteiler des Krieges.* Aristotle discusses problems of the justice of war and its relation to peace. A just war is (1) in self-defence, (2) to benefit the conquered, e.g., those unable to govern themselves, (3) to conquer those naturally intended to be slaves. War is not an end in itself, but a necessary preliminary to peace sometimes, and the defender of peculiar institutions and 'Kultur.'

**Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica.** XLIV. 1. 1916.

R. Sabbadini, *The composition of the Orator of Cicero.* Distinguishes two parts of the treatise (a) 1-139, originally a private letter to Brutus, subsequently amplified into a book addressed to the public, and ready for publication in July-Sept. 46.; (b) the rest of the treatise added later. P. Rasi, *Varia.* In Catalepton XIV. 9 defends the MS. reading 'aut mille coloribus ales' against the 'atque ignicoloribus alis' proposed by Schmid, who had however been partly anticipated by Scaliger and

Pithoeus. In Juv. I. 85 rejects Damsté's proposal 'quidquid agit homines' but suggests that by keeping 'agunt' (in the sense of 'agitant') and treating 'quidquid' as a collective subject and 'homines' as accusative, the same sense may be obtained. In Verg. *Georg.* IV. 132 where the MSS. fluctuate between 'animis' and 'animo' proposes the locative 'animi.' V. Ussani, *Rutilius Namatianus and Laurentius Valla.* Traces *disiecta membra* of Rutilius in the works of Valla. The archetypal MS. of Rutilius then probably existing at Bobbio may have been seen by Valla during his stay at Piacenza or Pavia. D. Bassi, *Unedited Papyri from Herculaneum.* Gives a fragmentary text of Papyrus 1670, and rejecting the view of Scott that this roll contained either the work of Epicurus περὶ φύσεως or that of Chrysippus περὶ προνοίας and Crönert's attribution of it to Philodemus, agrees that it deals with the Stoic doctrine of πρόνοια. E. Ciaceri, *The historic objectivity of the Thucydidean Speeches.* Thucydides puts in the mouth of his speakers not only what they said or would have said but also what they presumably thought, and that even when on the given occasion they certainly would not have expressed the thought. F. Ribezzo, ΚΑΣΙΓΝΗΤΟΣ. Holding with Kretschmer and others that the word means 'born of the same mother,' rejects the etymology αὐτὸ-τεκατι-γνητος and argues for αὐτὸ-κατι-γνητος (αὐτὸ-κατι-γνητος) where κατι represents a 'nomen actionis' with the meaning 'conception,' akin to the Latin 're-cens.' αὐτὸ-κατι-γνητος thus equals not 'eadem matre' but 'eodem conceptu' or 'eadem concipiente genitus.' O. Nazzari, Three articles: (i.) on the Greek and Latin declension of words in -ia. (ii.) on the Greek denominative verbs in -ω, -εω, -οω, -ιω, -υω. (iii.) on the etymology of ebrius and sobrius, -met and -te, and τράγος. C. O. Zuretti, *On Xen. Memorabilia IV. 4.* Shews how the salient traits of Hippias (πολυμαθία, contempt for positive law, habit of deriding his adversary) are brought out by Xenophon, and notes coincidences of thought with the Platonic dialogues. R. Sabbadini, *The pretended orations of Pliny again.* The four letters current under the name of Leonardo Bruni (for one of which see *Rivista XLIII.*, pp. 308-9) are adaptations of letters of G. Barzizza, with the names altered not merely as an epistolary exercise but with deliberate intent to deceive. C. Marchesi, *The first book of the Ars Amatoria.* Examines the structure, sources and date of the book, taking account of the views of Bürger, Tolkiehn and others.

## XLIV. 2. 1916.

D. Bassi, *Unedited papyri from Herculaneum.* Pronounces Pap. 1421 to be in 'most disastrous' condition and illegible save for a few words including the title Χρωτίππου περὶ Προνοίας. Gives a text and critical notes of parts of Pap. 1038. P. Ercole, *Juvenal VII. 134.* Explains 'stlattaria purpura' as 'purple bought from a pirate ship,' i.e. contraband and therefore cheap. M. L. De Gubernatis, *Questions in Probus I. The accusatives urbis urbes turrim turrem in Virgil.* Argues for the co-existence of both forms in Virgil, which is asserted by Probus (Gellius XIII. 21) and paralleled in the Marmor Ancyranum. C. Pascal, *De Catullianorum carminum inscriptionibus.* Maintains the genuineness of the titles prefixed to the poems of Catullus. G. Ginevri-Blasi, *On Pindar Pyth. VIII. 48-55.* Attempts to explain the allusion to Adrastus. S. Ferri, *De Hypatii Gangrenensis in draconem miraculo.* Publishes a scholiast on Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* VII. 17, giving an account of the incident. E. Bignone, *Studies in Plutarch. I.* A critical examination of the text, sources and contents of the treatise 'Non posse suauiter uiui secundum Epicurum.' F. Nencini, *On two epigrams of Martial.* In v. 77 'oleum ferre in auricula' = 'grauiter olentes aures habere' which reveals the presence of Marullus in the dark as effectively as a lantern (for this sense of 'oleum ferre' cf. Hor. *Sat.* II. 7. 34). In IX. 95 offers an explanation of 'Alphius ante fuit, coepit nunc Olphius esse.' Alphius = παιδικά, for ἄλφια is a reproach levelled at 'cinaedi' in Anth. Pal. XII. 187 (cf. ἀλφοτταῖ in

Athenaeus 281 e). By changing the *a* into *o* we reach 'Paedico' for the meaning of Olphius. V. Ussani, *Horace converted and an apostle of conversion*. A polemic against the view of Courbaud (*Horace, sa vie et sa pensée*. Paris 1914), who finds evidence in Horace of a moral crisis and conversion to Stoicism. G. Corradi, *The end of the reign of Seleucus Nicator*. An elaborate discussion of the chronology, disagreeing with Beloch and placing the battle of Korupedion in the autumn of 282 B.C. and the death of Seleucus in the spring of 281.

#### Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1915.

Dec. 20. H. Francotte, *Études sur Démosthène* (Fr. Cauer). Fruitful and attractive studies. T. Rice Holmes, *C. I. Caesaris Commentarii VII., A. Hirti Comm. VII.*, edited by T. R. H. (R. Oehler). Important and interesting.

Dec. 27. F. Steinmann, *Neue Studien zu den Gemäldebeschreibungen des ältern Philostrat* (Lamer). An excellent dissertation.

1916. Jan. 3. S. Marck, *Die platonische Ideenlehre in ihren Motiven* (Lehnert). One of the most important and acute works on this subject. T. Misson, *Recherches sur le paganisme de Libanios* (Asmus). Thorough and industrious.

Jan. 10. R. Th. Elliot, *Aristophanes, The Acharnians*, by R. Th. E. (R. Wagner). In this substantial and valuable book an unusual amount of solid matter is to be found. S. Krauss, *Monumenta Hebraica V. 1; Griechen u. Römer* (C. Fries). Practically a dictionary of Talmudic Antiquities; the classical nations appear in it from a one-sided point of view, which is however an important contribution to the general history of culture.

Jan. 17. Karl Hähnle, *Arretinische Reliefkeramik* (Lamer). H. is master both of the material and the literature. Nikos Bees, *Zur Sigillographie der byzantinischen Themen Hellas und Peloponnes* (Herke). Considering the large number of questions dealt with, the absence of an Index is regrettable.

Jan. 24. M. Jastrow, jr., *Babylonian-Assyrian birth-omens and their cultural significance* (Schulze). The critic often remains unconvinced.

Jan. 31. C. Fredrich, *Vor den Dardanellen, auf altgriechischen Inseln, und auf dem Athos* (Schwatzlo). Valuable even for scholars. O. Apelt, *Platons Dialog Menon*, übers. und erl. von O. A. Readable and exact.

Feb. 7. O. Maass, *Die Irrfahrten des Odysseus* (Stürmer). The critic dissents in the main. Fr. Kubiček, *Quomodo Tacitus in Annalibus et Historiis componendis senatus actis usus sit* (Andresen). H. Menze, *Repetitorium der lat. Syntax u. Stilistik*. 10 ed. (Nohl). Careful and trustworthy.

Feb. 14. W. H. Roscher, *Neue Omphalosstudien* (Nestle). Valuable. T. Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (Ziehen). Written with admirable competence.

Feb. 21. G. Roeder, *Aus dem Leben vornehmer Aegypter* (Wiedemann). Gives a clear picture of the autobiographical literature of ancient Egypt.

Feb. 28. H. Siögren, *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera. XI. Ep. ad Fam. rec. H. S.* (Sternkopf). Highly praised. A. Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte u. Verwaltung Aegyptens unter römischer Herrschaft* (Wiedemann). Interesting and well arranged.

Mar. 6. Fr. Stoble, *Der römische Legionär und sein Gepäck* (R. Oehler). G. Andresen, *P. Cornelius Tacitus Ab excessu D. A. I.-VI.* 11th issue of Nipperdey's edition (Ed. Wolff). Details are discussed.

Mar. 13. A. H. Weston, *Latin satirical writing* (Ziehen). Very competent work.

Mar. 20. C. Robert, *Oidipus* (H. Lamer).

Mar. 27. L. J. Richardson, *Greek and Latin Glyconics* (Draheim). The statistics are impressive, but not convincing. A. Knoch, *Die schottische Liviusübersetzung des John Bellenden* (Tolkiehn).

April 10. B. O. Foster, *The Trojan war again* (Stürmer). Unfavourable.

April 17. G. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum a G. D. condita nunc tertium edita.* I. (W. Larfeld). This volume edited under the guidance of H. von Gaetringen meets modern demands in all respects. N. Pappadakis, Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἰοείου ἐν Ἐρετρίᾳ (W. Larfeld).

May 1. K. Ch. Storck, *Die ältesten Sagen der Insel Keos.* (β). K. Meister, *Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen.* I. Altitalische u. römische Eigennamen (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). A remarkable achievement. C. C. Conrad, *The technique of continuous action in Roman Comedy* (P. Wessner). Thorough and conscientious. E. Schwabe, *Antike Erzählerkunst.* 12 Greek tales, collected and translated by E. S. (von Nohl). Careless and often misleading work.

### LANGUAGE.

#### *Glotta.* VII. 1-3. 1915.

H. Bergfeld, *On the nature of Latin accent.* Predominantly tone rather than stress. Makes no substantial contribution to the old assertions, though the clausula rhythm is appealed to. L. Radermacher, *On some Greek verb forms.* Derives opt. sg. ἀναβαῖ δοῦ εἰ from plurals ἀναβαῖμεν, etc.; analogy of contract verbs, ποιῶ: ποιούμεν. P. Kretschmer, *On the name of Adonis.* Rejects the Phoenician derivation and connects with the sept of ἥδος ("Ἀδωνις"). Γαύς (epithet); sept of gaudeo. Günther Jackmann, *On old Latin prosody.* Rejects pyrrhics due to iambic shortening in the 5/8 song measures (Bacchiacs, Cretics), chiefly by means of synizesis of meo- and eo eunt. 'Final,' not iambic, shortening in -ō. Ennius eschewed iambic shortening as vulgar and followed the pattern of the 'solemn' Saturnians. Franz Stürmer, *A summons to word-studies*, with methodic suggestions. W. Kroll, *Hist. Apoll.* 7 S 11, 3. Defends si ualeas. D. Detschew, *Thracian Inscription on the gold ring of Ezerovo* (Bulgaria). Capitalizes, divides and interprets as Ρολιστενεας Νερενα, Τιλταεν Ησκοα ρα ζα, δομεαν Τιλεζυπτα, μην εραζηλτα = R., Sohn des Nereneas, Tilatäer vom Gebiete des Flusses Iska, Einwohner vom Tilezypta, machte mich für sich. P. Kretschmer reviews this interpretation; makes, after F. Krohn, two hexameter lines of the text, the first ending with ησκο (= εἰρη), the second beginning with 'Αραζεα. Interpretation: ich bin R., Nerenia (gentile name, or the like) nach ihrer . . ., Arazerin nach ihrer Heimat. Tilezypta hat mich geschenkt (or, . . . geheiratet). Neither interpretation lies in the realm of definitive discussion: why not define εραζηλτα by 'radit' (e.g.), whence '(radendo) fecit'; or, in an 'engagement' ring, divide ερα-ζηλτα 'ulde amaut'? O. Lautensach, *Grammatical studies in Attic drama.* A. Subjunctives. 1. Lengthening of the (Homeric) mood-vowel. 2. Monosyllabic tense stems in -F -j -o, except of δεῖ 'binds,' leave their forms open. 3. Contracted endings. 4. -γθθα -γθτι. 5. Duals. B. Optatives. 1. a. Singulars in η; b. in ι (εη), in non-thematic forms. 2. Pres. act. of contract verbs; a. -οην forms; b. -οιμι forms (table, p. 110). 3. -ν in 1st pers. sg. pres. and aor. 4. Middle endings in -μην / -μαν. 5. -ατο / -ντο forms (table, p. 116). W. Kroll, *The Potential Subjunctive in Latin*, developed before our eyes from the will-wish-future Subjunctive. [cf. *Class. Rev.* xiv. 319; as regards *Bacch.* 735, K. forgets *non quia c. subj.*] W. Kroll, pp. 152-160, defends iambic shortening, especially against Jackmann, supra. J. Wackernagel, *Investigations in Homeric Language.* Part I. Attic Redaction; Part II. Atticisms of the Homeric poets (p. 319, index of passages). This article requires the attention of Homerists. Herbert Petersson, *Etymology of Latin arx.* From er(e)q-; cognate with *Orcus*, Armen. *orm* 'murus.'

nunc  
von  
καφῆ

ister,  
. W.  
nous  
vabe,  
ohl).

than  
usula  
t. sg.  
μεν.  
and  
ther  
the  
and  
ning  
mer,  
S II,  
erovo  
σκοα  
piete  
amer  
text,  
retat-  
nach  
inter-  
z by  
ηλτα  
unc-  
tems  
ngs.  
non-  
able,  
μαν.  
atin,  
Rev.  
160,  
agel,  
s of  
ation  
nate